THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine;

&c. &c. &c.

For SEPTEMBER, 1802.

Stulta eſt Clementia, cum tot ubique
Vatibus occurras, perituræ parc r chartæ.

JUVENAL.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

The Georgics of Virgil. Tranſlated by William Sotheby, Eſq. F.R.S. and A. S. S. London, Wright. 1800.*

VIRGIL, in his Georgics, has diſplayed, in a ſupreme degree, thoſe powers in which he moſt excelled; we mean taſte, judgment, and the graces of ſtyle. Having made choice of a ſubject which demanded every embelliſhment that could be given to raiſe it above its natural level, and to pleaſe, he put forth all his ſtrength "*anguſtis addere rebus honorem*," and has ſucceeded in giving to the world a poem which, in its kind, will ever ſtand unrivalled. With what art does he blend the preceptive part with his beautiful epiſodes! How admirably conceal what is mean by the ſplendour of his diction! Viewing his pictures of inanimate nature, inſtead of feeling languor and ſatiety, he rouſes, delights, and ſurprizes us, by giving life and motion to the whole. His plants and trees ſpeak to us; his bees, while they charm, inſtruct us; and, in his hands, the dull clod becomes a ſource of entertainment. Were this the place, much more might be ſaid on the ſubject; but we have ſaid enough to convince our readers that the tranſlation of ſuch a poem muſt be a truly arduous taſk. To give dignity in our own language to a ſubject where terms muſt be employed which are conſidered as mean, is a work of no ſmall difficulty. This difficulty has not deterred Mr. Sotheby—

---

* Accidents inſeparable from the nature of our publication have prevented us from ſooner noticing this work.

he has boldly ventured to exert his powers on the bow of Ulyſſes: with what ſucceſs the public will beſt judge, by a compariſon of his labours with thoſe of two of his moſt reſpectable predeceſſors.

We have made choice of part of Virgil's deſcription of the peſtilence among the animal creation; in which he wreſtles with his precurſor Lucretius,* and gives dignity and intereſt to a ſubject which, naturally, poſſeſſed neither.

" A dire example of this truth appears,
When, after ſuch a length of rolling years,
We ſee the naked Alps, and thin remains
Of ſcatter'd cotts, and yet unpeopled plains,
Once fill'd with grazing flocks, the ſhepherd's happy reigns.

" Here from the vicious air, and ſickly ſkies,
A plague did on the dumb creation riſe;
During th' autumnal heats th' infection grew,
Tame cattle, and the beaſts of nature ſlew.
Pois'ning the ſtanding lakes, and pools impure;
Nor was the foodful graſs in fields ſecure.
Strange death! for when the thirſty fire had drunk
Their vital blood, and the dry nerves were ſhrunk,
When the contracted limbs were cramp'd, even then
A watriſh humour ſwell'd, and ooz'd again;
Converting into bane the kindly juice,
Ordain'd by nature for a better uſe.
The victim ox that was for altars preſs'd,
Trimm'd with white ribbands, and with garlands dreſs'd,
Sunk of himſelf without the God's command;
Preventing the ſlow ſacrificer's hand;
Or, by the holy butcher, if he fell,
Th' inſpected intrails could no fates foretel.
Nor, laid on altars, did pure flames ariſe,
But clouds of ſmould'ring ſmoke forbad the ſacrifice.
Surely the knife was reddened by his gore,
Or the black poiſon ſtain'd the ſandy floor.
The thriven calves in meads their food forſake,
And render their ſweet ſouls before the plenteous rack.
The fawning dog runs mad, the wheaſing ſwine
With coughs is choak'd, and labours from the chine.
The victor horſe, forgetful of his food,
The palm renounces, and abhors the flood:
He paws the ground, and on his hanging ears
A doubtful ſweat in clammy drops appears,
Parch'd is his hide, and rugged are his hairs;
Such are the ſymptoms of the young diſeaſe,
But, in time's proceſs, when his pains increaſe,
He rolls his mournful eyes, he deeply groans
With patient ſobbing, and with manly moans.

* In his celebrated deſcription of the plague at Athens.

He

He heaves for breath, which from his lungs ſupply'd
And, fetch'd from far, diſtends his lab'ring ſide.
To his rough palate his dry tongue ſucceeds,
And ropy gore he from his noſtrils bleeds.
A drench of wine has with ſucceſs been us'd,
And thro' a horn the gen'rous juice infus'd,
Which, timely taken, op'd his cloſing jaws,
But, if too late, the patient's death did cauſe.
For the too vig'rous doſe too fiercely wrought,
And added fury to the ſtrength it brought.
Recruited into rage, he grinds his teeth
In his own fleſh, and feeds approaching death.
Ye Gods! to better fate good men diſpoſe,
And turn that impious error on our foes.

" The ſteer, who to the yoke was bred to bow,
(Studious of tillage, and the crooked plough)
Falls down, and dies, and dying ſpews a flood
Of foamy madneſs, mix'd with clotted blood.
The clown, who, curſing providence, repines,
His mournful fellow from the team disjoins:
With many a groan forſakes his fruitleſs care,
And in the unfiniſh'd furrow leaves the ſhare.
The pining ſteer no ſhades of lofty woods
Nor flow'ry meads can eaſe, nor cryſtal floods
Roll'd from the rock; his flabby flanks decreaſe,
His eyes are ſettled in a ſtupid peace.
His bulk too weighty for his thighs is grown,
And his unweildy neck hangs drooping down.
Now what avails his well-deſerving toil
To turn the glebe, or ſmooth the rugged ſoil?
And yet he never ſupp'd in ſolemn ſtate,
Nor undigeſted feaſts did urge his fate,
Nor day to night luxurioufly did join,
Nor ſurfeited on rich Campanian wine.
Simple his beverage, homely was his food,
The wholeſome herbage, and the running flood;
No dreadful dreams awak'd him with affright,
His pains by day ſecur'd his reſt at night."

Dryden's Georgics, book iii.

" This truth to know, th' aërial Alps behold,
And meads thro' which Timavus' ſtreams are roll'd,
And Noric cliffs with ruin'd caſtles crown'd,
Lo! waſte and wild the plains appear around;
Ev'n now deſerted ſtands the ſhepherd's ſtate,
And far and wide the lawns are deſolate.
Here ſprung of old, by ſickly gales begot,
A plague, with all the fires of autumn fraught;
Which ſlew the beaſts that range the field or wood,
Defil'd the freſhneſs of the cryſtal flood,
And ſcorch'd with baleful breath the graſſy food.

Strange kind of death! for when the parching pain
Had ſhrunk the limbs, and throbb'd in ev'ry vein,
A pois'nous humour flow'd from all the frame,
'Till every bone a putrid maſs became.
Before the ſhrine, in ſnowy fillets dreſs'd,
And holy bands, the conſecrated beaſt
Fell, and prevented oft the lingering prieſt;
Or, if he ſunk beneath the fatal ſtroke,
Lo! on the ſhrine his entrails fail to ſmoke.

" No more, miſled by many a doubtful ſign,
The prophet can the dark event define;
While ſcarce the knife with the faint tincture reeks,
Nor the thin gore the ſandy ſurface ſtreaks.
O'er flow'ry meads, or at the plenteous ſtall,
In lifeleſs heaps the calves and heifers fall.
The gentle dogs run mad, the ſick'ning ſwine
Pant with thick coughs, with ſwelling quinſies pine.
The victor horſe, forgetful of his food,
The palm renounces, and abhors the flood:
By fits he ſtamps the ground with eager feet,
While from his body burſts a doubtful ſweat,
That ſtood in icy drops, as death appear'd:
His parch'd hide to the touch is rough and hard.
Theſe ſigns at firſt his future fate preſage;
But as the ſpreading peſt improv'd its rage,
With ſanguine beams fierce glow'd his ardent eyes,
And heav'd his ſtruggling breath with groans and ſighs;
Of blood black torrents from his noſtrils ſprung.
To the ſwoln palate clove his furry tongue.
Some have at firſt with ſhort ſucceſs apply'd,
Pour'd thro' a horn, Lenæus' purple tide;
But ſoon freſh fuel to the growing flame
It gave, and death the medicine became:
While, with bare teeth, their limbs all bath'd in gore,
Ev'n in the bitterеſt dying pangs, they tore.
O crown, ye Gods! a pious people's prayer,
And let the bad alone ſo dire an error ſhare.

" Lo! while he toils the galling load beneath,
Foaming black blood, the bullock ſinks in death:
The penſive hind the brother-ſteer relieves,
Who faithful for his loſt companion grieves,
And the fix'd ſhare amid the furrow leaves.
Nor graſſy mead, nor ſhade of lofty grove,
The mournful mate's afflicted mind can move:
Nor yet from rocks delicious ſtreams that roll
As amber clear, can ſooth his ſorrowing ſoul:
His flanks flow looſe, his eyes grow dim and dead,
And low to earth he bears his heavy head.
Ah! what avails their ceaſeleſs uſeful toil?
What boots it to have turn'd the ſtubborn ſoil?
Yet, ne'er choice Maſſic wines debauch'd their taſte,
Ne'er did they riot in the rich repaſt;

Their

Their food is leafy browze, and nature's graſs,
Their draught freſh rills that thro' the meadows paſs,
Or torrents ruſhing from the rocky ſteep;
Nor care diſturbs their ſalutary ſleep." Wharton.

" Caſt o'er Timavus' meads thy mournful ſight,
O'er Alps, and forts that crown the Noric height,
How wide the waſte! where flocks and ſhepherds ſpread,
The cot unpeop'ed, and the lawn unfed.
There baleful Peſtilence o'er æther caſt
Her ſpotted wings, and fir'd th' autumnal blaſt,
Smote all that graz'd the field or rang'd the wood,
Scorch'd every plain, and poiſon'd every flood.
Dire was the death; for when th' internal flame
Had ſhrunk the veins, and parch'd the ſhrivell'd frame,
Infected moiſture flow'd, and day by day
Sap'd the ſoft bones, that piece-meal ooz'd away.
Oft, while the ſnowy fillet wreath'd his head,
The votive bull, before the altar led,
Ere yet the knife deſcending ſmote his brow
'Mid lingering Flamens dropt without a blow.
Or if the victim ſunk beneath the wound,
No altars blaz'd with hallow'd entrails crown'd.
Vainly to fullen Gods the prieſt complains,
And ſpeechleſs Augurs weep 'mid ſilent fanes:
The blood ſcarce reddens, while the wound yet reeks,
And putrid gore the ſand's light ſurface ſtreaks.
Calves 'mid rich fields and flow'ry paſtures fall,
Loath the full crib, and periſh in the ſtall;
Convulſions ſhake the ſwine's obſtructed breath,
And the fond dog, infuriate, foams in death.
Forgetful of his fame, the victor ſteed
Leaves the tranſlucent rill and flow'ry mead:
Looſe flap his ears, his hoof oft beats the ground,
His waſted limbs in fitful ſweats are drown'd;
Sweats that, as dying pangs the victim ſeize,
Chill every pore, and life's flow current freeze.
On his dry ſkin the hairs in briſtles ſtand,
Riſe to the touch, and roughen on the hand.
Such the firſt ſigns: but as the peſt drew near,
More horrid ſymptoms mark'd his dire career;
The eye-ball glares, deep breath with hollow tone
Heaves the long flanks, and burſts with frequent groan.
The tongue furr'd o'er th' obſtructed palate fills,
And from the noſtrils ſable blood diſtils.
Wine, pour'd thro' horns, that ſeem'd to ſooth the peſt,
But lull'd awhile to tranſitory reſt.
Soon, rous'd to vengeance, with recruited ire,
The monſter rag'd, and wing'd th' internal fire,
While with bare teeth the courſer madly tore
His limbs in death, and bath'd his jaws in gore.
At once the bullock falls beneath the yoke,
Blood and mixt foam beneath his noſtrils ſmoke:

He groans his laſt:—the melancholy ſwain
Leaves the fix'd plough amid th' unfurrow'd plain,
And frees the lonely ſteer, whoſe mournful eye
Beholds with fond regret a brother die.
Him, nor repoſe can ſooth in foreſt ſhades,
Nor dewy paſture 'mid luxuriant glades,
Nor ſtreams that, roll'd o'er rocks, thro' graſſy plains
More pure than amber wind their cryſtal trains.
His glaz'd eye droops, each flaccid flank extends,
And prone to earth his ponderous neck deſcends.
Ah! what avails his unremitting toil
And patient ſtrength that tam'd th' unwilling ſoil?
Yet his pure lip from feaſts of blood refrain'd,
Yet no cruſh'd grape his draught with poiſon ſtain'd;
The leaf, the herb, the graſs his ſimple food,
His drink the lucid fount and living flood:
No care corroded, nor diſturbing woes
Broke the deep ſtillneſs of his calm repoſe."

We have little heſitation in pronouncing this ſpecimen of Mr. Sotheby's tranſlation ſuperior to either of the other two; and we at the ſame time are of opinion, though in ſome paſſages he may yield the palm to Dryden and Wharton, that he has, upon the whole, produced a more chaſte and correct tranſlation, ſomething which approaches nearer to the perfection of the great original. Why Mr. S., in the extract we have given, ſhould have left untranſlated

" Dî meliora piis, erroremque hoſtibus illum,"

we cannot ſay, unleſs, perhaps, he thought it an aukward parentheſis. In other places we have obſerved ſome omiſſions of the ſame kind: in the firſt book, Virgil's "*nudus ara, ſere nudus*" is not tranſlated, though it is to be preſumed that *he* conſidered it as an eſſential precept. A like omiſſion occurs in the third book: there, in the original, we have a deſcription of the characteriſtics of a perfect horſe; in which the colours to be choſen, and thoſe which are to be rejected, are

——— " Honeſti
Spadices, glaucique; color deterrimus albis,
Et gilvo:"

in the tranſlation nothing of this appears. And not to dwell longer on this diſagreeable part of our duty, the name of Mæcenas is totally omitted at the opening of the firſt book, ſo that a reader, who knows the Georgics by the tranſlation only, will be ſurprized to hear that, in the original, they are addreſſed to him by name.

The original accompanies the tranſlation on the oppoſite page, and the work is elegantly printed.

Belſham's *Memoirs of the Reign of George III.*
(Continued from Vol. XII. P. 151.)

THE fifth volume, with increaſed ardour, inculcates the doctrines and ſentiments which the four former volumes endeavoured to diſſeminate and promote. We find the ſame hoſtility to the conſtituted authorities, both of church and ſtate; the ſame indiſcriminate

enmity

enmity to his Majeſty's miniſters, whoſoever they were, and to the meaſures of government, whatſoever their tendency or their effects. As in the former part we perceive a man not objecting merely to this council or to that miniſter, but to every council of the legiſlature, every act of the executive government and every ſervant of his Majeſty, ſo in the preſent, one ſhort and ſimple propoſition may expreſs all which the author attempts to demonſtrate.

The following is its true enunciation: *Whatever the King of Great Britain has done in his executive capacity; or he, the Lords, and Commons, in their legiſlative have done, is ipſo facto fooliſh and wicked.*

So very comprehenſive a theorem which by multiplied repetition of aſſertion he has demonſtrated to his own ſatisfaction, affords opportunities for *practical corollaries* which he either educes or hints. If indeed government and legiſlature be ſo extremely bad as he repreſents, the inference is very obvious.

In obſerving that there is an identity of object and principle between his preſent and his former volumes, we muſt notice a conſiderable difference in the operation. The volume which cloſed 1792, a period when the friends of this conſtitution were alarmed for its ſafety, and its enemies ſanguinely expected its downfal, Mr. Belſham wrote in all the elation of confident hope. The proſpects of levelling republicaniſm afterwards vaniſhed; Mr. Belſham now writes under the gale of diſappointment. Under this impreſſion the preſent book uniformly deſcends to perſonal obloquy and invective; which though they frequently occurred did not entirely overſpread the preceding memoirs.

The poor man is evidently in a great paſſion with kings, miniſters and parliaments; and in that paſſion writes his hiſtory for the inſtruction of mankind. But a ſhort analyſis of this notable performance will evince its merits much better than any thing we can ſay.

The volume includes four years from the beginning of 1793; to each of theſe years is allotted a book, carrying the narrative to the cloſe of 1796, and the rupture of Lord Malmſbury's firſt negotiation. One occurrence he ſteps forward half a year to notice; this was the death of Edmund Burke, whom he ſtyles the grand incendiary of Europe; and whoſe diſſolution, copying from Mackormick, he imputes to the irritability of his temper.

Prefixed to each book is a long table of contents, as a bill of fare, pointing out the quality as well as the articles of the entertainment; and, to continue the analogy, indicating the caterer's great fondneſs for French cookery, as we afterwards find manifeſted in the ſeveral diſhes as well as the whole fare.

The work commences with the Parliamentary debates on the correſpondence between Monſieur Chauvelin and Lord Grenville, whom, conformably to the French phraſeology, he deſignates *Miniſter for foreign affairs.* Mr. Belſham firſt introduces us to Mr. Pitt repreſenting the fate of the King of France in terms of the moſt high flown rhetorical exaggeration. The Parliamentary ſpeeches and reſolutions, with alſo the propoſitions of Mr. Fox and his ſupporters,

moſtly quoted at full length, as they are found in the new Annual Regiſter, compoſe this part of the narrative. Here we have to obſerve, that our author, in what he calls his Parliamentary hiſtory, neither preſents to the reader the general views of the contending parties, and of their moſt efficient members, nor the relation of ſpecific meaſures of either to theſe general views. An account of a parliamentary ſeſſion, or of a military or naval campaign, by a ſkilful writer, may be woven into one whole, and muſt be ſo, to conſtitute hiſtory. Mr. Belſham, however, may ſay that he only profeſſes to write memoirs. It may be ſo; but from memoirs we expect at leaſt information, if not finiſhed compoſition; and what information is contained in a huddle of extracts from the New Annual Regiſter's abridgment of Debret's Parliamentary Debates, we profeſs ourſelves unable to diſcover. So much for the political commencement. We are next carried to military operations, but receive from the author no view of the objects of the campaign either on the one ſide or the other. An hiſtorian, in deſcribing a campaign, ought to ſhew what was propoſed to be done. Why was it propoſed to be done? How was it done or not done? What was the reſult to the one ſide or the other, as to the purpoſes of the war? The reader ought to have placed before him objects, cauſes, diſpoſitions, operations and events, to enable him, as much as poſſible, to perceive the ſeries and connection, otherwiſe the narrative carries, if any, unavailing information and no inſtruction. Attending military operations until the evacuation of the Netherlands by the French armies, he preſents a tranſient glimpſe of the ſtate of France; from whence he makes rather an abrupt digreſſion, in order to reprobate a memorial preſented from his Britannic Majeſty by Lord Auckland to the States General, exhorting them to prohibit the murderers of the king from finding an aſylum from deſerved puniſhment. This *ſanguinary* memorial (as our author phraſes it) he deduces from the ſpirit of popery at this time inflaming the court of London, inſtigated by Dr. Horſeley (p. 41,) and in recompence for whoſe good ſervices in diſſeminating that ſpirit, he (according to our author) was promoted to the biſhopric of Rocheſter. From the gloomy ſcene of Britain he repaſſes to the bright and favoured land of France: gives a ſtill more ſhort and deſultory account of the ſucceſſes of the allies in 1793, to the capture of Queſnoy in September. Hence we are hurried back to England, and find ourſelves in the preceding ſeſſion of parliament. As a proof of the folly and iniquity of the Britiſh miniſters, is mentioned their refuſal to open a negotiation proffered them through the hands of Mr. John Saller, *notary public!* Mentioning the bankruptcies of 1793, he imputes them to the war, although ſo clearly demonſtrated to have ariſen from a totally different cauſe—the diminution of the uſual paper accommodation. Mr. Grey's motion on parliamentary reform affords an opportunity for quoting the Sheffield petition; and for abuſing Mr. Pitt as a *perfidious miniſter*; BECAUSE, having propoſed a preciſe definite plan of reform, in one kind of circumſtances, he had not in a kind of circumſtances totally different

agreed

agreed to an undefined project of reform. Paſſing over to Irelan , he mentions the ſociety of United Iriſhmen, then begun; and ſtyles them an aſſociation of the friends of liberty. He next proceeds to the Scotch c nvention, which he admits to have met for obtaining univerſal ſuffrage and annual parliaments. The puniſhment inflicted on theſe ringleaders of ſedition he ſtyles extremely tyrannical. This ſubject produces a freſh occaſion for venting his gall againſt a miniſter who was certainly a very effectual opponent of the parliamentary *reform* which theſe men ſought. "The amiable qualities (he ſays) of the individuals who were condemned, excited a general ſympathy for their ſufferings, and inſpired into the breaſts of thouſands a perfect deteſtation of the man and the miniſter who had raiſed himſelf to power by his pretented zeal for the cauſe of parliamentary reform, and had now become the moſt implacable proſecutor of thoſe who ſtill retained the principles which he had abandoned; preferring poverty, exile, and death, to the poſſeſſion of riches and honours, purchaſable only at the price of an *infamous and profligate apoſtacy*."

In this quotation Mr. Belſham advances a direct falſhood. Mr. Pitt never was the abettor of the reform propoſed by theſe innovators, and therefore could not be an apoſtate from ſuch doctrines. But, beſides, is this ſcurrility the ſtyle of dignified and ſober hiſtory? Is it not rather the language of a demagogue ſeeking the praiſes of a democratical club, than of an hiſtorian undertaking to narrate truth for the inſtruction of mankind; or more properly of a furious agitator enraged againſt the government whoſe vigorous policy cruſhed the efforts of ſuch agitators. But abuſe of the miniſter would be inſufficient without invectives againſt the conſtituted authorities. Speaking of Scotland, he ſays, as "*the forms of procedure in the criminal courts of that kingdom are extremely arbitrary, and the evidence admitted in them to the laſt degree vague and ſlight*, the puniſhment annexed ought at leaſt to be mild and moderate: but admitting the charges againſt the preſent delinquents to be fully proven, the ſentence paſſed upon them was ſo diſproportionate to their guilt, that the whole tranſaction was calculated to excite, and in fact it did excite general indignation and horror, not in Britain only, but throughout Europe."

Mr. Belſham's aſſertions concerning the judicial courts of Scotland are totally unfounded. We defy him to produce any evidence juſtifying this ſtatement. Reſpecting the indignation and horror excited throughout Europe, we find no document or inſtance except the authority of a *German newſpaper*.

From the judicial proceedings of Scotland we return to the political proceedings of France, and the military operations of the autumnal campaign. The terrible ſyſtem of Robeſpierre had now, by the ſubjugation of the Girondiſts, removed all internal rivalry, and allowed the rulers to domineer at pleaſure. Hence had ariſen the extraordinary ſcheme of arming the people *en maſſe*; or, in other words, of compelling every man to leave his home, and become the ſoldier of the revolutionary decemvirate. On this deſign our hiſtorian beſtows

ſtows very high praiſe. "In a ſeſſion (he ſays) of the French Convention, held Auguſt 16th, the energetic and fertile genius of Barrere conceived the ſublime project of exciting the whole people of France to riſe *en maſſe*."

The effects of this plan in reſtoring the affairs of the revolutioniſts; in compelling the Duke of York to raiſe the ſiege of Dunkirk; in overpowering the friends of monarchy and religion in La Vendee; in promoting the advances of terroriſts and jacobins on every ſide, are detailed with evident pleaſure, and at a length probably intended to atone for the ſhortneſs of the narrative which comprehended the capture of Valenciennes and the diſappointment of jacobin arms. His endeavours to hold up to ridicule and contempt the loyaliſts, we cannot repreſent ſo characteriſtically of the author as in his own words.

"Notwithſtanding the very ſerious aſpect which the rebellion in La Vendee had for a time worn, the efforts of the convention were eminently ſucceſsful alſo in that quarter. The character of the inſurgents, who were the devoted adherents of church and king, was made up of ignorance, ſuperſtition and barbarity. It was ſaid that they mingled the ſacramental wine with the blood of their adverſaries, and adminiſtered it to the people. On one of their captured ſtandards, preſented to the Convention, was embroidered on one ſide the figure of a biſhop in his pontificals, and on the reverſe the Virgin Mary with an infant Jeſus."

The following part of this book is principally devoted to the proceedings againſt the Girondiſts, the murder of the Queen, and the renunciation of religion revealed and natural. Here we muſt do Belſham the juſtice to admit that he teſtifies indignation and horror againſt ſo fell enormities. But while reprobating the barbarities of the revolutionary tribunal, he creates opportunities for aſperſing and degrading the character of its royal object, and pours out the moſt unqualified abuſe againſt the late Queen of France.

Speaking of the naval conqueſts of England during this campaign, in order to diminiſh the acquiſitions, he ſays; "maritime conqueſts ſeem regarded by the Engliſh nation almoſt as a matter of courſe. This expectation was not diſappointed in the preſent war, conducted even by thoſe weak and incapable miniſters who ſo unneceſſarily and unjuſtifiably plunged the country into it." In ſhort, the general complexion of the firſt book is abuſe of the politics of the Britiſh government.

The ſecond book commences with the ſeſſion of parliament 1794. The parliamentary hiſtory, like that of the former year, conſiſts chiefly of extracts from the various ſpeeches often repeated in periodical publications. With theſe extracts are interlarded panegyrics on the opponents of government. A conſiderable portion of the work is devoted to the repetition of the various arguments ſo often hackneyed by the parliamentary friends of the French revolution. In ſumming up his account of a debate concerning the introduction of the Heſſians, without conſent of parliament, our author obſerves; "upon

"upon the whole, and on a general review of the debates in parliament reſpecting this great conſtitutional queſtion, Mr. Pitt appears to have been the only man who took a decided part againſt the intereſts of his country."

When his Majeſty announced the avowed intentions of the enemy to invade this country, our author expreſſes himſelf with great triumph. He ſays,

"So ſoon were the loſty and boaſtful predictions of miniſters falſified, and their pride humbled, by a change of fortune of which they would not previouſly ſuppoſe the poſſibility. A great augmentation of the militia, and an addition of volunteer ſencible corps, were accordingly voted, and the *dangerous and doubtful* expedient reſorted to of ſoliciting voluntary ſubſcriptions, by a formal letter written by the ſecretary of ſtate to the lords lieutenants of the ſeveral counties of the kingdom."

During the whole narrative of the parliamentary proceedings of 1794, containing upwards of fifty pages, we have not met with a ſingle paſſage really illuſtrating the views and arguments of the different parties and ſpeakers, nor any hiſtorical information not trite to every one who read the common newſpapers. Far as we are from approving the New Annual Regiſter in point of principle and tendency, yet as to execution it bears the marks of hiſtorical ſkill and arrangement. From it a reader might learn what parliament was doing; he might perceive a beginning, a middle, and an end; in ſhort, if not authenticity or impartiality, at leaſt unity of deſign. But here, though there be, as we before obſerved, one ſimple object, yet there is no uniform ſyſtem of means. The effect which he wiſhes to produce is obvious; but it is no leſs evident that he wants ſkill and ability to give colour and conſiſtency to his propoſed miſrepreſentations. We ſhould think practice before this time might have made him more dexterous in miſtatement. An able hiſtorian, whether he means to diffuſe a good or bad ſpirit, muſt know and practiſe diſtillation. If he intend a noxious beverage, he is not to content himſelf with merely huddling together the refuſe of damaged grains. It was not ſo that Rouſſeau and Voltaire laboured to overthrow religion and monarchy. To deſcend nearer Mr. Belſham's level, even Thomas Paine, inſtead of filling his book with quotations, amalgamates his materials into one maſs. If he too collect ſcraps from other men's tables he ſtews them into one ollapodrida, which, ſeaſoning to the palates of ſuch gueſts as his, he eaſily infuſes the maddening potion. But Belſham ſets before his gueſts the mere offals.

The account of this ſeſſion of Parliament, ſuch as it is, being finiſhed; after ſome parenthetical abuſe of Lord Spencer, Lord Fitzwilliam, the Duke of Portland, and Mr. Windham, borrowed from the daily repetitions of the Morning Poſt and Morning Chronicle, he proceeds to the campaign of 1794. Every man who paid the ſlighteſt attention to the late momentous war, muſt ſee that its efforts and events divide themſelves into two great branches. The operations

of

of the allies, in which Britain bore a part; and the operations in which Britain acted alone. The former, not depending chiefly upon this country, were, on the whole, unfortunate and humiliating to thoſe principally concerned. The latter depending ſolely on Britiſh genius, courage, energy, and ſkill, were fortunate and glorious. Theſe two lines of belligerent exertion, though in themſelves ſo clearly diſtinct, our author either weakly or wilfully confounds. At the ſame time he beſtows his chief portion of detail on the diſaſters of the confederates; and is very ſhort and general in his account of Britiſh victories. We have alſo to remark in his hiſtorical ſcenery a very frequent mixture of other parts which ought to have been kept ſeparate. And as this confuſion does not always promote the great objects of his performance, we do not always impute it to intention, but ſometimes to the want of hiſtorical ability and ſkill: the victories of Pichegru and Jourdain in the fatal 1794 are repeated, not without accuracy of detail. Deſirous, however, as he is of doing honour to the republican generals and armies, he diſplays no knowledge of their military conduct. If there be any new ſyſtem of tactics, any new ſcheme of military progreſs, an hiſtorian competent to deſcribe war will diſcover it, explain its principle, action, and conſequences. Pichegru changed the ſyſtem of advancing warfare; and propoſed to bring his whole force as rapidly as poſſible againſt the enemy in the field, regardleſs of fortreſſes which in his progreſs he might leave behind. The French this year deviſed and employed new modes of poſting with troops and artillery. Theſe changes in the ſyſtem and expedition of war this writer paſſes unnoticed. In deſcribing a battle, a competent hiſtorian will ſhew the relative ground, force, and diſpoſition of the contending armies, the modes of attack and defence, the continuation or change of poſition and manœuvre; in ſhort, the point on which ſucceſs turns. Mr. Belſham praiſes his heroes in the lump, without ſhewing any comprehenſion of their diſtinctive and appropriate talents and exertions. An able hiſtorian, though he deteſted the cauſe for which the French fought, would place the military merits of their generals in a much more ſtriking and favourable light than this their political partizan. To a man competent to write the hiſtory of war, the march of Lord Moira affords a ſubject to animate energy and exerciſe ſkill. A few lines diſmiſs this able and celebrated movement. The laſt effort of the Britiſh arms in defending Holland, though unfortunate, were, as all Britiſh efforts have been, ſignally honourable. Of theſe the account is almoſt equally curſory. A very ſhort and vague ſummary is given of the glorious victory by Lord Howe; in which, not expreſsly ſtating but indirectly admitting the defeat of his country's enemies, he conſoles them and himſelf by diminiſhing the glory and importance of the victory (ſee p. 182). Our atchievements in the Weſt Indies he barely mentions. Detailing the proceedings of Robeſpierre and the completion of deſpotiſm, he brings the internal affairs of France to the depoſition and death of the tyrant.

Shifting

Shifting the ſcene to Britain, he introduces, as a detached epiſode, the departure of Dr. Prieſtley for America. He, our author tells us, had been driven from his philoſophical retirement into the centre of the kingdom by the mad outrages of a barbarous people, *excited and encouraged by perſons, however exalted above them in rank, ſcarcely leſs barbarous than they.* We cordially agree in Mr. Belſham's repróbation of any or all perſons who inſtigate the populace to diſorder and tumult. Who were the perſons of rank that encouraged the riots at Birmingham? "But, (our author proceeds) under the adminiſtration of Mr. Pitt, bigotry and malignity advanced with an accelerated progreſs, and every ſpecies of improvement, moral, intellectual, or political, ſeemed gradually to become the object firſt of cold indifference to this *inſidious ſtateſman*, then of diſlike, and at length of fear, of hatred, and of horror."

We immediately after find ſome clue to this ſcurrilous, ribalrous abuſe. Mr. Belſham quotes the authority of Dr. Bedoes, the ravings of whoſe diſtempered imagination, and the ſputterings of whoſe rage, this profound critic miſtakes for genius and ſenſibility (p. 195.)—The epiſode concludes with a long quotation, proving, from the works of Bolingbroke, that the ſame ſun, moon, and ſtars are to be beheld in America as in England.

We now return with our author to his narrative, which proceeds to the trials for high treaſon, which are introduced in the following terms: "The perſons who in the month of May had been committed to priſon, on the charge of a democratic conſpiracy to overturn the government, were kept in cloſe confinement the whole of the ſummer. It alſo happened that two men, Watt and Downie, on grounds totally different, were brought to trial in Scotland for high treaſon at this juncture; and *this incident might be regarded as the prologue to the fearful and bloody tragedy which it was in contemplation of the adminiſtration to perform in England*; and their conviction might be ſuppoſed to have a powerful effect on the mind of the Engliſh juries." The ſtory told by Upton of a conſpiracy to aſſaſſinate the king, is ſo introduced by our author as to appear another branch of miniſterial preparations for an iniquitous proſecution of Hardy, Tooke, Thelwal and their aſſociates. Were we indeed to receive the impreſſion which Mr. Belſham means to convey, there never was a ſyſtem of more bloody and murderous tyranny in the annals of deſpotiſm than that which the executive government of Britain attempted and the legiſlature ſeconded. But if the ſhaft be poiſoned it is not noxious, borne down by its intrinſic heavineſs it flies not to the mark. *Habet ſub arundine plumbum.* The detail of theſe trials is a mere repetition of trite facts and common-place obſervation. An able hiſtorian would on ſo important a ſubject have preſented to his readers a view of the treaſon laws as enacted by parliament in the reign of Edward III. and as ſince underſtood by judges and lawyers, in order to ſhew how far it applied to the facts charged; Mr. Belſham merely touches on this ſubject; his chief attention is beſtowed

on

on the evidence of perſons whom he inſinuates to have been ſuborned by government. The following reflection on the acquittal is perfectly in unison with the general ſtrain of his imputations againſt government.—" Had the miniſtry ſucceeded in this infamous proſecution, which no Attorney General, however reſpectable his private character, or whatever plea he might ſet up of profeſſional duty, could engage in without *incurring eternal diſgrace*—had they once dipped their hands in blood, they would moſt ſurely have gone on in the ſame ſanguinary courſe till the whole land had become an aceldema—a ſcene of carnage and deſolation." Is this *furious invective*, HISTORY! So much of this portion of the *narrative* as is not devoted to obloquy, conſiſts of quotations from Mr. Erſkine's ſpeeches, including Mr. Erſkine's quotations from Dr. Johnſon. The embaſſy to China, and the diſmemberment of Poland, occupy moſt of the remainder of the ſecond book. The ſubjection of Poland he imputes to the want of that energy in the people which would have attacked their king and eſtabliſhed monarchy. On this ground he ſeverely cenſures a part of Koſciuſko's proclamation that inculcates reſpect to the king. The Poles, Mr. Belſham deems deſervedly ſubdued, becauſe they did not imitate the French.

" In this emergency (ſays our author) no chance of ultimate ſucceſs could poſſibly remain, but in the adoption of the daring and deciſive meaſure of ſummoning a National Convention, and of eſtabliſhing a new conſtitution founded *upon the broadeſt baſis of democracy*—a conſtitution in the preſervation of which every individual would have felt himſelf deeply and permanently intereſted—*a conſtitution which, as in France, would have excited the genuine ſpirit of republican enthuſiasm*, which would have converted Poland, like France, into an armed nation, and have infuſed into the breaſts of all the heroic, the determined reſolution to conquer or to die. But to a grand and glorious effort like this the genius and talents of Koſciuſko did not appear equal: *on the contrary*, a proclamation was publiſhed, ſtating, 'That as the Poliſh inſurrection took place upon principles eſſentially different from thoſe prevailing in France, it ſhould be differently conducted; and that the king,' [whoſe timidity and duplicity (Mr. Belſham parenthetically obſerves) had rendered him juſtly deſpicable in the eyes of all,] 'ſhould be treated with the deference and regard due to his rank.' It is difficult to conceive whoſe favour Koſciuſko could hope to conciliate by this *tame and diſgusting declaration*. Had America, France, and it may be added England, *heſitated* in ſimilar circumſtances *to proceed to the depoſition of their reſpective ſovereigns*, the revolutions effected in theſe ſeveral countries would have borne for ever the appellation of treaſon and rebellion. *The original principles of the French revolution were no other than the genuine and immutable principles of liberty*; and although theſe principles were doubtleſs more liable to abuſe under a democratic than a mixed form of government, it was by the eſtabliſhment of a pure democracy only, that, in Poland, the maſs of the people, ſtupified by oppreſſion, could be awakened to a juſt ſenſe of their inherent rights, or inſpired with the invincible reſolution eſſential to the defence of them. From the publication of the proclamation in queſtion, perſons of diſcernment augured the ſpeedy and melancholy termination of this unequal conteſt."

The

The third book of this volume purſues the parliamentary hiſtory of 1795 on the ſame general plan of vilifying both government and parliament, and the ſame means, quotations from oppoſition ſpeeches, as they are to be found in Debrett's Debates and the Annual Regiſter for the year; but without any information or view that had not been hacknied through periodical works. To prop up arguments worn out and weak, he now and then introduces a joke, which, for aught we know, may paſs for wit with his readers.

Mentioning the marriage of the Prince of Wales, he involves in his account an aſſertion containing a groſs libel on the Prince. "It was (he ſays) well underſtood that the Prince acceded to this alliance with much reluctance: his attachment to the accompliſhed Mrs. Fitzherbert, with whom *the marriage ceremony*, though invalid by law, *had undoubtedly paſſed*, having ſuffered no diminution. His Royal Highneſs having, when this ſubject was before agitated, impowered Mr. Fox to contradict this report in parliament." We deſire to know upon what authority Mr. Belſham charges the heir apparent of the crown with advancing a direct falſehood. Where are the documents by which he can make good an aſſeveration ſo injurious to its exalted ſubject. It is not a mere effuſion of that rancorous gall which this outrageous democrat uniformly pours out againſt princes. In the Twelfth Night Sir Andrew Aguecheek not being able to combat an adverſary, is by his friend adviſed to vent his rage in ſwearing at him. Much pleaſed with an advice which he could ſo eaſily follow, "Nay, (ſays the knight) let me alone for ſwearing." Mr. Belſham finding neither his facts nor his arguments, with all the auxiliary quotations, contain any real force to overpower the champions of the Britiſh conſtitution, endeavours to make up the deficiency by ſcolding; and, (as Sir Andrew phraſes it) calling names: Pitt is a profligate *apoſtate*, *a blood-thirſty tyrant*; Burke is *an eloquent madman*, *a demoniac*, *a grand incendiary* of Europe.

The military events on the continent in 1795, compared with the preceding campaigns, do not occupy much of the hiſtory. This affords, however, the author an opportunity of heaping freſh abuſe on the loyaliſts of La Vendee. Turning to the internal revolution in France, he beſtows very high praiſes on the directorial government, and repreſents the FIVE as a conſtellation of genius and virtue. Returning to England, he finiſhes this book with the meeting of the Correſponding Society at Copenhagen-houſe.

Book the laſt opens with the inſults offered to the King in his way to and from parliament. The Treaſon and Sedition bills follow, clouded as uſual with quotations from the oppoſition ſpeeches. From all this heap of citations no reader can educe the exact changes which theſe bills effected, nor the reaſons of either ſupport or oppoſition. Indeed we do not think that either here nor in any other part of his parliamentary narrative a reader could, from Belſham, perceive the ſcope and chain of oppoſition policy and reaſoning. Eager as the author is to hold them up to excluſive admiration, it is not by a

tiſſue

tiſſue of detached quotations that an able author could ſhew biographically the genius and eloquence of Mr. Fox, but by concatenating his meaſures, propoſitions, and reſults. It is not by a tiſſue of quotations that an author can hiſtorically ſhew the wiſdom or folly of ſyſtems or meaſures, but by ſhewing their cauſes, circumſtances, and effects.

We will venture to ſay, that an able hiſtorian, inimical to the political object of Mr. Fox, would convey to the reader a much clearer and a higher idea of his intellectual character, as operating during the period before us, than is here preſented by Mr. Belſham. An able Roman would much more adequately exhibit the talents of Hannibal, than a bungling Carthagenian. Without following our author through his parliamentary citations, which could be new to no reader, we attend him to his account of the celebrated campaign in 1796: here there was room for the author to ſhew his favourite French forming a very grand and comprehenſive plan, and carrying it, in its principal field, into the moſt effectual execution. Still, however, we have nothing but patchwork of detail. In Germany we ſee that Jourdan advanced and was driven back early in the ſeaſon; that Moreau, at a later period, retreated, and that is all. We neither ſee, on the one hand, the energy of the Archduke Charles invigorating the Germans to combat the rapacious invader on the north, and driving him back to France, nor, on the other, the maſterly ſkill with which Moreau, on the ſouth, deſerted by Jourdan, in retreating, kept his enemy at bay.

But the more momentous operations in Italy affording ſo ample a theme for hiſtorical deſcription, conſiſt of a mere curſory ſummary of marches, battles, and ſieges, without any view of the talents and energies employed, or the effects produced. Eagerly as Mr. Belſham is attached to the French republicans, we do not apprehend Buonaparté, were he deſirous of having a hiſtory of his campaigns written in Engliſh, would chuſe for his hiſtoriographer Mr. Belſham. This laſt book terminates with Lord Malmſbury's negociation; in his review of which, our author abridges the outlines of Mr. Erſkine's pamphlet, and juſtifies the French in every part of their conduct, faithfully repeating the allegations of the French miniſters.

The ſixth volume opens with the ſeſſion of parliament 1796-7; and, as uſual, repeats, or abridges Debrett's Debates. Lord Malmſbury's negociation at Paris coming on by the repetition of the correſpondence between our Ambaſſador and La Croix, puſhes forward the hiſtory about eight pages. Next follows a long quotation from the often repeated reveries of the noted egotiſt.

Our author now profeſſes to take a view of parties. Among the opponents of the war and miniſters, Mr. Belſham ranks the learned, and eſpecially thoſe whom he calls 'a highly eſtimable claſs of men, combining with their literary and philoſophical acquirements a perfect knowledge of the great volumes of human nature and human life.' This aſſertion of our hiſtorian, though not true, is the fabrication of another,

another, a no leſs reſpectable philoſopher, the learned and profound Mr. John Thelwal; that ſage obſerves, in *his* anſwer to the Letter on the Regicide Peace, "except the *ſcribbler* Burke, the literary part of the community is *pure*, *we* are of a mind." *

In ſpeaking of that wiſe and vigorous meaſure which ſaved the Bank, our author delivers himſelf as follows:

"A bill was forthwith introduced, confirming the order of council, and ſuſpending the law for preventing the iſſue of notes under five pounds value; in conſequence of which, the circulation of ſpecie was ſuſpended, and the kingdom inundated with notes of twenty ſhillings and forty ſhillings value. A clauſe of the utmoſt importance was alſo inſerted, for preventing any perſon from being held to bail who offered Bank of England notes in diſcharge of debts; which was going, to every practical purpoſe, the length of making them a legal tender. But as government collectors, and officers of the revenue, were not only permitted, but obliged, by a clauſe of the bill, to receive theſe notes in payment of taxes, immenſe as they were now become, no inconſiderable inconvenience was in fact felt from this extraordinary ſtate of things, by any claſs or deſcription of perſons. The notes themſelves ſuffered not the leaſt depreciation; and the diſaſtrous conſequences which might, with great probability, have previouſly been ſuppoſed to reſult from the *daring and deſperate* conduct of the miniſter, were happily found to be fallacious."

In his account of the mutiny, either from ignorance or deſign, he paſſes over its ſource in Jacobinical arts, from which this alarming convulſion proceeded. Reverting to parliamentary quotation and narrative, he takes an opportunity of panegyrizing Sir Francis Burdett: "a young man (ſays our hiſtorian) of great perſonal and political rectitude of character, accompanied with lofty ſentiments of liberty, which time and experience only were wanting to mellow and mature." We have, of late, had a ſample of this ripened crop of political rectitude.

We now find a long digreſſion concerning parliamentary reform; containing a miſplaced repetition of hacknied arguments. From Britain, our hiſtorian, without any previous intimation, tranſports us to Italy, and tries to follow the ſteps of Buonaparté. Willing as he is to praiſe a man who, according to him, is a hero who unites to every virtue the powers of the moſt diſtinguiſhed genius, he neither ſhews the military talents nor political conduct of the French general. Having beſtowed twenty-eight pages on the atchievements of our enemies, he devotes two to the ſplendid victories of St. Vincent and of Duncan; thence he diverges to the internal affairs of France, and conducts us to the ſecond negociation with England. The document, from which he makes up the chief part of this account is a pamphlet entitled *The Queſtion ſtated*; and which (he ſays) is an admirable work.

* See Thelwal's Vindication of the Rights of Nature againſt the Uſurpations of Eſtabliſhments.

However that may be, our author certainly finds it a very uſeful one to him, as numerous extracts from it ſerve to fill up the compilation. The reſt of this account conſiſts of copies of diplomatic correſpondence. This book is cloſed with invectives againſt the national thankſgiving for our naval victories; the whole order of biſhops, and eſpecially the Biſhop of Lincoln, becauſe in a ſermon he had drawn a contraſt between religion and atheiſm, juſtice and confiſcation, order and anarchy, and had proved Britain to be happier than France. The following obſervation on the clergy is foiſted into a note. "The cauſe of religion, it has been well obſerved, is a modern motive to war, invented by the chriſtian prieſthood refining upon the heathen. The extreme calloufneſs of the higher orders of the clergy in general, to the miſeries of mankind, is indeed a ſtriking feature of the profeſſion. Wholly abſorbed in the exalted feelings of devotion, they riſe far ſuperior to thoſe of humanity." The parliamentary hiſtory of 1797-8 proceeds on the ſame plan as before, and requires no particular mention until the ſtate of Ireland comes to be conſidered. The account of the Iriſh conſpiracy and the rebellion endeavours to impute the convulſion to the miniſters, as his models, democratic orators and writers, had done before him. A detailed recitation of trials next follows, including a very prolix account of Doctor Gilbert Wakefield's pamphlet and puniſhment.

Our author now proceeds to the expedition of Buonaparté to plunder and ſubdue Egypt; and with oſtentatious parade exhibits the victories of diſciplined Europeans over Arabs and Egyptians. The battle of the Nile, a theme which would have inſpired the fervour of a patriotic Briton, is diſmiſſed in a general and vague deſcription. Following the effects of this memorable victory, he cloſes his hiſtory with the renewal of the confederacy againſt France.

These are the principal materials which we have been able to extract out of this chaos. From our analyſis our readers will, we truſt, perceive that our ſtatement of its object is perfectly correct; that throughout it propoſes to reprobate every meaſure, act, character, or political body, which is friendly to the Britiſh conſtitution; that from the time it arrives at triumphal democracy, maddened into Jacobiniſm, the virulence of this *hiſtorian* againſt his country is proportionably increaſed.

But our loyal and conſtitutional friends will conſole themſelves for the malignity of the purpoſe by the flimſy futility of the performance. Though the ſpirit be willing yet the efforts are weak. Indeed, we apprehend no Jacobin of talents and erudition can approve of this rhapſody, becauſe he muſt ſee it is not likely to promote Jacobinical purpoſes, except among readers for whom there are much more appropriate works to Jacobinize already. They will perceive that it is only a compilation, weakening by verboſity the more conciſe and nervous efforts of Tom Paine, and hundreds of his diſciples. They will ſee that there is not a ſingle fact, aſſertion, argument, or remark, to be found in four hundred and eighty-eight pages, which has not been

been ſo often re-echoed as to be thoroughly familiar to every peruſer of the Jacobin regiſters, reviews, and newſpapers.

If, therefore, we Anti-Jacobins reprobate the deſign of this work, we rejoice at the deſpicable weakneſs of the execution. We are glad that, ſince a Britiſh Jacobin has undertaken to revile his country, the writer ſhould be—Mr. Belſham.

Monographia Apum Angliæ; or, An Attempt to divide into their natural Genera and Families, ſuch ſpecies of the Linnæan Genus, Apis, as have been diſcovered in England, &c. 8vo. 2 vols. Pp. 642. Plates. By William Kirby, B. A. F. L. S. Rector of Barham in Suffolk. White, London.

NO province of nature preſents a more curious diverſity of forms, a happier adaptation of organs and energies to their reſpective uſes, or a more wonderful harmony of relations, than we may find among inſects.

Yet, ſince the greater part of theſe ſmall animals have but a remote and indirect regard to the convenience of human life; as the minuteneſs of their forms, and the general brevity of their terms of exiſtence, elude careleſs obſervation; as ideas of filth and poiſon are connected with the appearance of many of them; ſince their numbers too, are ſo manifold; it is not ſurpriſing that, of almoſt all the branches of natural hiſtory, that which regards inſects, ſhould have remained nearly to the preſent time, in the moſt imperfect ſtate of culture.

Linnæus firſt produced a ſyſtematic arrangement of theſe animals, at once ſufficiently comprehenſive, and in a due degree minute in its diſtinctions. He diſtributed all inſects into ſeven orders; taking the diſtinctive marks from variations in the ſtructure of the wings, or from the entire abſence of theſe organs. In his firſt order, denominated COLEOPTRA, he placed inſects having the membrane of the wing completely covered with a horny or cruſtaceous caſe. Inſects with wings partly cruſtaceous, and conſiſting in part of an uncovered membrane, compoſe, under the title of HEMIPTERA, his ſecond order. The LEPIDOPTERA, the third order, have the wings covered with ſcales minute and fine as if they were ſtrewed with powder. The fourth order, the NEUROPTERA, contains thoſe which have four membraneous wings, tranſparent, and uſually reticulated with veins or nerves. Thoſe which, with four membraneous wings, have likewiſe a ſting in the tail, are named HYMENOPTERA, and compoſe the fifth order. The DIPTERA, forming the ſixth order, are diſtinguiſhed as having but two wings, while the other orders, excepting the Coleoptera, have not fewer than four. The APTERA, the ſeventh order, are without wings. The known genera, under theſe orders, not fewer in number than an hundred and twenty-one, are diſtinguiſhed by characteriſtics aſſumed

from the antennæ, the parts of the mouth, the ſtructure of the head, the thorax, and the abdomen. Under theſe genera are comprehended a numberleſs multitude of ſpecies, diſtinguiſhed from one another, in every different genus, by differences in colour, in the ſtructure of particular parts, in habits, and in the changes of form through which they reſpectively paſs.

FABRICIUS, erecting a ſyſtem entirely different from that of Linnæus, employs for the foundations of his arrangement the diverſities in thoſe parts of the organization with which inſects take their food. He diſtributes the genera into eight ſeparate claſſes: the *Eleuterata*, the *Ulonata*, the *Syniſtata*, the *Agonata*, the *Unogata*, the *Gloſſata*, the *Rygota*, and the *Antliata*. That this is an arrangement beautifully ingenious is not denied. The new facts which its author has, from his own enquiries, added in it, to the natural hiſtory of inſects, are many and important. But to the utility of the ſyſtem is, with reaſon, objected, that the organization of the parts with which inſects take their food, is too minute and uncertain to be aſſumed as the baſis of a claſſification, in which the individuals ſhall be at all times eaſily and clearly referable to their proper places. It is urged, that neither was the ſyſtem of Linnæus ſo very imperfect, nor is this ſyſtem of Fabricius ſo much more orderly and natural, as that it could well become the author of the latter to offer by this, to ſuperſede the work of his maſter. They who now ſtudy the hiſtory of inſects are divided into the followers of Fabricius, and thoſe who ſtill prefer the method of Linnæus. On the Continent, many of the accounts of new reſearches, in this part of the animal kingdom, are accommodated rather to the order and the peculiar language of Fabricius. In Britain, as it ſhould ſeem, the inſectology of Linnæus is ſtill chiefly in favour.

Mr. KIRBY, in the firſt part of his book, diſtinguiſhes himſelf as, in this path, one of the ableſt and moſt zealous followers of the Swediſh naturaliſt. His obſervations on the Linnæan claſs of *Hymenoptera*, filling nearly one half of the firſt volume, cenſure, with an earneſtneſs which we cannot entirely approve, the ambition of Fabricius to raiſe a new ſyſtem; trace the progreſs of the diſcoveries relative to inſects having uncovered membranaceous wings from Charleton, Liſter, and Ray, to Linnæus, Geoffroy, Fabricius, De Geer, and Latreille; particularly explain ſome peculiar phraſeology of the Fabrician ſyſtem; attribute due praiſe to Gmelin's attempt, in the laſt edition of the *Syſtema Naturæ*, to enrich the ſyſtem of Linnæus, with all the genuine improvements of Fabricius; ſpecify many inſtances in which Mr. Kirby has, by his own obſervation and reſearch, diſcovered inaccuracies in the deſcriptions of both Fabricius and Linnæus, that deeply affect the generic ſubdiviſions in their reſpective ſyſtems; and predict to the method of Linnæus an immortality which, this writer thinks, to be ſecured to it, by its happy adaptation to receive every poſſible future improvement, without change in its fundamental ſtructure.

More accurate obſervation with the microſcope has enabled Mr. Kirby

Kirby to deſcribe the parts of thoſe inſects of which he writes the hiſtory, with new preciſion and minuteneſs. The ſecond part, therefore, of his work, contains definitions of the Latin terms which he is afterwards to employ: and theſe definitions correct the inaccuracy of former naturaliſts, and enlarge their deficiencies, ſo as to accommodate the terms to convey exactly what this author has to communicate. He in theſe definitions conſiders the whole inſect as compoſed of the three parts, the HEAD, the TRUNK, and the ABDOMEN. The head he ſubdivides into nine different parts, under ſome of which are comprehended ſeveral inferior ſubdiviſions. The trunk conſiſts of ſix parts here ſpecified, with a variety of ſubdiviſions under theſe. The parts of the abdomen are two, with their ſubdiviſions. The table of theſe terms, with their definitions, is illuſtrated by a ſeries of uſeful critical remarks immediately following it.

The next part of this work contains a new delineation of the natural characters of the Linnæan claſs of *Hymenopterous* inſects, and a ſcheme, to which that is preparatory, of this writer's new arrangement of the genera and families of the *Apes*. Linnæus comprehended all theſe under the ſingle genus of *apis*. Mr. Kirby divides them into two genera, *melitta* and *apis*. Between theſe, the moſt eſſential diſtinction is, that the *lingua*, or cartilaginous organ for ſuction, is in the *melitta*, ſhort in the point, ſtraight, flattiſh, and incloſed in a ſheath of a form nearly cylindrical; while, in the *apis*, the *lingua* is longer, and is bent to one ſide. There are, beſide theſe, differences in the other parts, which, with the former, may be, in all, ſufficient to eſtabliſh the generic diſtinction that Mr. Kirby contends for. To ſubdivide the genera into *families*, he ſought for marks of diſtinction in the habits, anatomy, and œconomy of the ſpecies. The genus *melitta* he diſtributes into two families, comprehending five ſubdiviſions in all. The genus *apis* contains, in this arrangement, likewiſe, two families, ſubdivided into ſeven branches. The illuſtrations which follow, of the diſtinctive characters of theſe families, ſufficiently explain the propriety of the diſtribution, while they at the ſame time beſpeak, in Mr. Kirby, an extenſive acquaintance with the writings of other naturaliſts, and add, from his own obſervations, not a little to what we before knew reſpecting this part of nature.

The latter part of the firſt volume exhibits copies of two plates; the one containing figures to illuſtrate the definitions of the genus *melitta*; the other equally illuſtrating thoſe definitions which peculiarly belong to the genus *apis*. The objects in the plates are clearly and ſatisfactorily explained in detail.

Next follows, in the beginning of the ſecond volume, a view, in abſtract, of the ſpecies belonging to the families of the genus *melitta*, which are in number 111, and of the ſpecies of the genus *apis*, the number of which amounts to 110.

The laſt diviſion of the work, filling the greater part of the ſecond volume, preſents deſcriptions of all the ſpecies—the ſynonyma applied to them by different authors—references to the collections, or muſea,

in which ſpecimens of them are to be ſeen—and certain miſcellaneous obſervations in Engliſh, which are interſperſed among the Latin, in which the other information in this part of the work is, with due propriety, written

At the end are indices of the trivial names, and of ſynonyma, with ſeveral plates exhibiting figures of ſome of the more remarkable of thoſe new ſpecies which are here, for the firſt time, named in the printed pages of natural hiſtory.

Of the induſtry, the ingenuous fondneſs for the ſtudy of nature, the acuteneſs of diſcrimination, and the ſkill of lucid arrangement, which are evinced by Mr. Kirby, in the contents of theſe volumes, we feel ourſelves utterly unable to convey to the reader any adequate idea in ſuch an account of them as it is here convenient to give. He has added almoſt two-thirds to the ſpecies of *Apes*, whoſe exiſtence had been obſerved by former naturaliſts. By the diviſion of the genus into two, he has produced an arrangement more uſeful to the ſtudent and the collector of ſpecimens, than that which he brings it to ſuperſede. His defence of Linnæus, and his cenſure of Fabricius, though perhaps ſomewhat over-zealous, are well-ſupported. The improvements which he ſuggeſts, in the diſtribution of the genera in the claſs of *Hymenopetra* are, plainly, judicious and important. We know not that any ſtudent in inſectology has ever examined the inſect-form with attention more accurate and minute. A portion of the piety of Ray and Derham pervades the work, and renders it truly worthy of a clergyman of the Church of England, and even an honour to the church to which he belongs. The difficulties which occur in the inveſtigation of this province of natural hiſtory, and its manifold relations to the utilities of common life, add much to the importance of a work ſuch as this. We value it alſo as an honourable ſpecimen of that culture of natural hiſtory which has been excited in this country, by the tranſference of the cabinet of Linnæus to London, and by the eſtabliſhment of that ſchool of naturaliſts which now exiſts among us in the LINNÆAN SOCIETY.

That Mr. Kirby's Latin ſtyle is not more excellent than that of the other naturaliſts of the ſchool of Linnæus; that the differences between his *melitta* and his *apis*, are ſcarcely important enough to form a generic diſtinction; that the ſpecies are haſtily and unneceſſarily multiplied in this account of the bee; and that, notwithſtanding all his care, differences merely ſexual have ſometimes been miſtaken by him, as if they had been ſpecific; may be poſſibly aſſerted in cenſure of this work by others. We, however, have been too much pleaſed and inſtructed by it to retain the ſlighteſt inclination to uſe the language of cenſure.

Archæologia; or, Miſcellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity.

(Concluded from Vol. XII. P. 368.)

THE 12th article is "*Copies of two Manuſcripts on the moſt proper method of Defence againſt Invaſion*, by Mr. Waad." The author, ſays the Rev. Mr. Ayſcough the producer, who found them amongſt the MSS. in the Britiſh Muſeum, was ſent into Spain at the beginning of the year 1583-4, was afterwards knighted by King James in 1603, and made Lieutenant of the Tower. He wrote them, he ſays himſelf, "when the alarms of the Spaniards approached." Yet "in anno 88," he tells us, "there was ſpecial order given for the defence of the Iſle of Thanet." And he notices "theſe long times of peace and reſt, whereby we are generally grown to untowardlineſs in martial actions." He alſo notices "certain orders" as "meet to be obſerved upon any *foreign invaſion*." He particularly blames the diſuſe of the pike, then growing upon our ſoldiery; and ſays,

He once interrogated "certain French captains, ſome of them antient in years, and ſuch as were of the religion," and "demanded" from them "the reaſon that had moved them to give over that defenſible weapon the pike, and to betake them altogether to ſhot. Not to ſay diſliking or other cauſe, ſaid they, but for that we have not ſuch perſonable bodies, as you Engliſhmen have, to bear them; neither have we them at that commandment as you have, but are forced to hire other nations to ſupply our inſufficiency, for of ourſelves we cannot ſay we can make a complete body. Moreover they affirmed, that in the time of Newhaven, if we had let them have but 6000 of our armed pikes, they would have marched through all France; ſo highly eſteemed *they* of the pike, who nevertheleſs in our judgment ſeem to have given over the ſame, or to make ſmall account thereof."

When, however, theſe two papers were written, Mr. Waad does not ſay, Mr. Ayſcough does not explain, and we have not leiſure to ſettle.

The 13th article is another manuſcript found in the ſame place, and furniſhed by the ſame perſon, as "*An expedient or meanes in want of money to pay the ſea and land forces, or as many of them as ſhall be thought expedient, without money in this year of an almoſt univerſal povertie of the Engliſh nation.* By Fabian Philipps."

This is dated "4 July 1667." The ſcope of it will appear from a ſingle extract, at the cloſe.

"If we kept our own coined money at home, and carried not away the foreign coin and moneys which came in unto us; if we made, as our neighbour nations have done, ſome inferior baſe mettled moneys to help to ſave our moneys; and did our people not ſuffer ourſelves to be deluded with the evill deſigns and talk rather than reaſon of thoſe, that gain by beggaring our heretofore rich and flouriſhing nation, that the more moneys are ſent out of England the more will come in, when it is ſent out as faſt as it comes in, with much of that which we had of our own before,

as if England had mines of gold and ſilver inexhauſtib'e; as if depths had no bottom, breadths or lengths had nothing to terminate it [them], but were infinite; and as if our people of England, whoſe merchants and traders at ſea are not one in every thouſand of our many people (ſervants, women, and children excepted), were all or the greateſt part as the Dutch, who with their wives and many of their children and ſervants do continually employ themſelves in trade; and being the great and common carriers of the world, ingroſſers of all the trade thereof, and more cunning traders into all the parts of it, are ſure if they carry out their moneys to bring in a great deal more with advantage."

The 14th is an "*Explanation of a Seal of* Netley Abbey, *in a letter from the* Rev. John Brand, ſecretary." This is too ſhort an article to bear any extract from it, and too inſignificant to provoke any comment upon it.

The 15th is an "*Explanation of a Seal of the* Abbey of Lundores in Scotland," by the ſame perſon.

The 16th is a "*Copy of an original Inſtrument dated* 25 Nov. 1449, *concerning the church yard of* St. Mary Magdalen *in* Milk Street, London."

The 17th is a "*Copy of an original Letter from* Queen Elizabeth *to the* Earl of Warwick," urging him to a gallant defence of Newhaven, and promiſing him a ſpeedy ſupply.

In the 18th we find what holds out to us a hope, of relief for a moment from the continued dullneſs of the articles immediately preceding, an "*Account of Flint Weapons diſcovered at* Hoxne *in* Suffolk, *by* John Frere, Eſq. F. R. S. and F. A. S."

Such weapons have often been diſcovered; but theſe were diſcovered in a ſite and with accompaniments, that render them ſingularly inviting to an antiquary.

"They lay in great numbers at the depth of about twelve feet, in a ſtratified ſoil which was dug into for the purpoſe of raiſing clay for bricks. The ſtrata are as follows [follow]: 1. vegetable earth 1½ feet; 2. argill 7½ feet; 3. ſand mixed with ſhells and other marine ſubſtances 1 foot; 4. a gravelly ſoil, in which the flints are found, generally at the rate of five or ſix in a ſquare yard, 2 feet. In the ſame ſtratum," this of No. 4, "are frequently found ſmall fragments of wood, very perfect when firſt dug up, but which ſoon decompoſe on being expoſed to the air; and in the ſtratum of ſand (No. 3) were found ſome extraordinary bones, particularly a jaw-bone of enormous ſize, of ſome unknown animal, with the teeth remaining in it. I was very eager to obtain a ſight of this; and finding it had been carried to a neighbouring gentleman, I enquired of him, but learned he had preſented it, together with a huge thigh bone found in the ſame place, to Sir Aſhton Lever; and it therefore is probably now in Parkinſon's Muſeum. The ſituation in which theſe weapons were found, may tempt us to refer them to a very remote period, even beyond that of the preſent world," an inſinuation that ſurely ought not to have been publiſhed by the ſociety, becauſe it is as audacious as it is ridiculous.—"But, whatever our conjectures on that head may be, it will be difficult to account for the ſtratum in which they lie being covered with another ſtratum;

ſtratum; which, on that ſuppoſition, may be conjectured to have been once the bottom, or at leaſt the ſhore, of the ſea. The manner in which they lie, would lead to the perſuaſion, that it was a place of their manufacture and not of their accidental depoſit; and the numbers of them were ſo great, *that* the man who carried on the brick-work told me, *that*, before he was aware of their being objects of curioſity, he had emptied baſkets full of them into the ruts of the adjoining road."

From this intimation concerning the flint weapons, and from the preceding of their being "in great numbers," there appears plainly to have been a manufacture of them here; the only one ever diſcovered in the iſland. This manufacture was carried on, upon what was then the native gravel of the ground. But the manufacture, from its very quality, appears to have been before the introduction of metals into the iſland, or at leaſt before the copious fabrication of metals into weapons. Then the ſea broke into this hollow, which is by Mr. Frere's own account *nine* feet above the ſand accumulated by that irruption of the ſea, while the ſand itſelf is only one foot thick with ſhells and other ſubſtances marine; and the ſea, retreating afterwards, left a clay of $7\frac{1}{2}$ feet and a vegetable earth of $1\frac{1}{2}$, to accumulate ſucceſſively upon the ſea ſoil. But, at this irruption of the ſea, came in ſome ſea animal that was left there and buried under the accumulated ſoil; whoſe "extraordinary bones, particularly a jaw bone of enormous ſize, together with a huge thigh bone," were "found in the ſame place." *When*, therefore, did this animal, and theſe ſhells, come to cover the Britiſh manufacture of flint weapons at Hoxne? Did they come at "a very remote period, indeed," even beyond "that of the preſent world?" No, certainly.

The late John Ives, Eſq. publiſhed in 1774 Remarks upon the Garianonum of the Romans.* In this light and lively eſſay that modeſt, ingenuous, and virtuous young gentleman, whom the writer of the preſent article knew perſonally in London about the year 1774, has overlooked the eſſential point of all. He has produced no evidence, to prove Burgh Caſtle in Suffolk the antient Garianonum. Yet he has unwittingly produced ſome, that proves it *not* to be ſo. Burgh Caſtle appears from his plates, *not* to be upon the river Yare, the Garion of the Romans, as the very name of Garianonum neceſſarily requires it to be; but to lie upon the Wavency. This ſingle circumſtance is fatal to his whole ſcheme. Then, as the Yare is *traditionally ſaid* to have *formerly iſſued into the ſea* "juſt under Caſter" in Norfolk,† and, as Mr. Ives confirms the tradition,‡ Caſter, as the only fort upon the Yare, is the true Garianonum of the Romans. Mr. Ives, indeed, makes his tradition to extend the mouth of the Yare from Burgh Caſtle to Caſter. So it aſſuredly did extend, at this irruption of the ſea into Hoxne valley. Accordingly Mr.

---

* P. 25. † Gibſon's Camden, 465. ‡ Ives, p. 5.

Ives's

Ives's old map, "ex antiquâ in pergamen. delineatione illuminat." and dated conjecturally "A. D. 1000," carries the Yare into the ſea by two openings, one at Burgh Caſtle, and the other at Caſter, divided only by the large ſand on which Yarmouth now ſtands. Yet the fact being this, that Burgh Caſtle ſtands upon the Waveney and not upon the Yare, upon the Waveney before it falls into the Yare, it could never be called Garianonum. But the anchors, rings, and other pieces of iron, the deep beds of ſea-ſhells, and particularly of oyſters, which have been found about the walls of Burgh Caſtle,* ſerve to prove *the much ſtronger influx of the tide up to this place formerly than now.* Caſter in Norfolk, then, is Garianonum, the ſeat of the Stableſian Horſe. Caſter, indeed, is a much more commodious poſition for cavalry, than Burgh Caſtle in Suffolk; *this* being among the rivers and marſhes, while *that* is upon champaign ground.† Nor will Mr. Ives's argument, from the exiſtence of a great æſtuary here in the time of the Romans, remove the objection. The rivers Waveney and Yare would ſtill be clipping it in, on the weſt and north; while the marſhes or iſland of Lovingland clipped it in, on the ſouth and eaſt. No poſition could poſſibly be more injudicious for horſe, than this. Nor would the Romans, we may be very ſure, have ever ſelected it for horſe. Then its more inward ſituation, when compared with the ground of Caſter, this being juſt on the very brink of the ſea, and (as tradition ſays) at the very mouth of the Yare, has been very juſtly urged by Spelman againſt the idea, of placing Garianonum at that place inſtead of this.‡ Caſter, about a century ago, had ſeveral remains about it, though it has none at preſent. Spelman deſcribes it even in Mr. Ives's citation from him, as "Muri et muniminis rudera prodens."§ Many coins of the Romans are alſo allowed by Mr. Ives to have been found there.‖ And, as the name certainly concurs with all to prove it a Roman fort, ſo does it plainly appear from the Yare once iſſuing under it into the ſea, to have been the Garianonum of the Romans. When therefore did the Yare change its courſe, and turn ſouthward to ſalute the ſea at Yarmouth? "About the time of Edward the Confeſſor," ſays Mr. Ives, "the ſea retreated from the ſand at the mouth of the æſtuary," which is formed by the Yare aſſiſted with the Waveney, and "on which Yarmouth now ſtands."¶ This retreat of the ſea from the ſand of Yarmouth, fixes the æra of its receſſion from Hoxne valley; as, previouſly to this, "even the Waveney itſelf was navigable" up to Burgh Caſtle. "At the walls" of this caſtle, as Mr. Ives informs us, "have frequently been diſcovered parts of anchors, rings, and other pieces of iron, which, however uncouth in their appearance," as antique in their age, "could have been of no ſervice but for maritime uſes; and muſt either have belonged to the veſſels of the

---

* P. 9—10. † P. 3—4. ‡ P. 4. § P. 4. 7. ‖ P. 17. ¶ P. 7.

garriſon,

garriſon, or have been left there by thoſe unfortunate navigators, who in early times viſited this dangerous coaſt. It is alſo to be remarked, that *every where round the walls* of the camp are found *immenſe quantities of ſea ſhells*, particularly thoſe of the oyſter, *forming a ſtrata* [ſtratum] *ſeven feet deep*,'* plainly therefore deſerted by the receſſion of the ſea at the mouth, and buried when the flints were covered in the vale of the Hoxne. The flints muſt have been deſerted when metals were fabricated copiouſly into weapons. The ſea broke in afterwards with the ſea-animal, and covered them with only *one* foot deep of ſands, ſhells, or other marine ſubſtances. "Upon obſerving the flat country for four miles," adds Mr. Ives, unconſciouſly againſt himſelf, concerning "the diſtance between Caſter and Burgh, a conſiderable part of which is ſtill water, and retains a Saxon appellation" of Bradan, or the Broad Water; "it evidently appears to have been *once covered by the ocean*, and the mouth of the Yare, at that time, an æſtuary or arm of the ſea: tradition, the faithful preſerver of many a fact which hiſtory has overlooked or forgotten, *conſiſtently and invariably aſſerts it.*"† Here then we have in abundance, what refutes the wild tale of this *ſecond Brydone*, that would carry the exiſtence of a vulcano or an æſtuary up into a period anterior to the world itſelf, and upon ſuch frivolous reaſonings or ſuch falſe arguments as would make our intellect the mere fool of our fancy.

And now a bubble burſts, and now a world.

The diſcovery at Hoxne proves, that in the time of the *Britons* the ſea did not reach to Hoxne. But the diſcoveries at Burgh Caſtle and at Caſter prove, that in the time of the *Romans* the ſea broke in upon the land, and formed a large æſtuary of four miles broad, which ſent up its tides as far as Hoxne itſelf, lodged an enormous ſea-animal upon the ground at which flints had been previouſly ſhaped into weapons, and covered it with ſands, ſhells, or other ſubſtances marine, to the depth of even a whole foot. And the erection of Yarmouth upon the ſea-ſand at the mouth of the Waveney united with the Yare, proves the ſea to have receded in the times of the Saxons, to have firſt receded from Hoxne as high eſt up the Waveney, to have therefore left only *one* foot of marine ſubſtance, but to have afterwards retreated from Burgh Caſtle as lower down the Waveney, to have latterly retired from Caſter as near the mouth of the Yare, and to have thus left the ſand of Yarmouth naked for the reception of a town upon it. The manufacture at Hoxne was co-eval probably with the invaſion of Cæſar, when the little iron of the iſland was all confined to the ſouthern kingdoms, and all the braſs in it was merely what was imported;‡ but poſterior certainly to the original

---

* P. 9—10. † P. 5.

‡ De Bell. Gall. v. 12. "In maritimis ferrum, ſed ejus exigua eſt copia; ære utuntur importato."

migration

migration of the Gauls into Britain, about the three-thouſandth year of the world,* and as certainly poſterior to the extenſion of population into Norfolk, ſome three or four hundred years afterward. Nor was this retirement of the ſea, ſo reſponſive as it is to its encroachment before, to be brought down into the lateſt period of the Saxons, into the days of the Confeſſor, or even the year 1000. The very town, which was erected upon the bared ſand, had been erected ſo long before the Confeſſor himſelf, that even in his reign it had no leſs than ſeventy burgeſſes in it. "Gernemwa," ſays Doomſday Book expreſsly, though unnoticed by Mr. Ives, there "tenuit Rex Edwardus *ſemper* lxx Burgenſes." Where then are *the numbers unnumbered* of ages "beyond that of the preſent world," which the raſh hand of Mr. Frere has accumulated for the diſcoveries at Hoxne? They are gone with Mr. Brydone's ante-mundane vulcano, and *both* their authors with them, each aſtride upon his hobby-horſe, and each driving with the blaſt. Yet whither are they gone? Let Milton anſwer.

All theſe upwhirl'd aloft,
Fled o'er the backſide of this world far off
Into a limbo large and broad, ſince called
THE PARADISE OF FOOLS.

The 19th is an "*Account of Antiquities from* St. Domingo. From Thomas Ryder, Eſq."

This gentleman's brother, a lieutenant of the royal navy, "had them delivered to him by a ſailor (who had promiſcuouſly ſtrung them together); and which ſailor obſerved, he received them from a runaway negro, who took them out of a cave near Cape Nicholas, which few negroes had the courage to enter, it being traditionally a god's cave." This cave then was the wretched temple of the natives, and theſe antiquities the wretched repreſentations of their gods. Nor can any figures be conceived as idols, more expreſſive of the ſtupidity of man in worſhipping them for gods, and for them turning off from the God of all glory.

"XX. *Obſervations on* Stone Pillars, Croſſes, *and* Crucifixes, *by* Thomas Aſtle, Eſq. F. R. S. and F. A. S." The eſſay is at once learned, ſenſible, and pleaſing.

"XXI. *Obſervations on* Mr. Townley's *antique bronze Helmet, found at* Ribcheſter *in* Lancaſhire. By the Rev. Stephen Weſton, B. D. F. A. S." Here we have an eſſay ſhort but ſtrong, actuated with taſte, and animated with knowledge.

"It ſeems then to me," Mr. Weſton remarks, "that theſe exquiſite remains of antique ſculpture are of the beſt Roman work on the Greek model, and of the times of the Antonines; and that the head-piece, though found in the ſame heap of ſand with the vizor, does not properly belong

* Brady on Boroughs, p. 3, and Little Domeſday, fol. 118.

to

to the maſk, which was itſelf antique, when the cap or petaſus was fitted to it."

All this, however, is ſo darkly expreſſed, that we do not underſtand what "theſe exquiſite remains of antique ſculpture" are, whether the head-piece or the vizor, or both; why the vizor is ſeemingly made diſtinct from the maſk, by the difference of expreſſion for it; and why "the maſk" is ſaid to have been "itſelf antique, *when* the cap or petaſus was fitted to it." But we proceed.

"This covering indeed" of a head-piece "is totally unworthy of its place" as connected with the maſk or vizor, "being evidently of another age, ſomewhere between Severus and Conſtantius Chlorus. With this cap I have nothing to do at preſent," though the article is entitled obſervations on a *helmet!* "The piece of antiquity now before us, is what I conceive to have been uſed as a maſk or vizor, at ſome ſacred feſtival, on a day of proceſſion, when the rites and orgies of the divinity repreſented by it were celebrated. In Callixenus's account of the proceſſion to Ptolemy Philadelphus, in honour of Bacchus at Alexandria, the ſtatue of the god was adorned with maſks, chaplets, and mitres."

For this and other reaſons, he ſuppoſes the maſk to have been uſed at a feaſt in honour of Bacchus; but he left us ſome time at a loſs to know, whether he had not made the ſtring of the mitre to faſten the *vizor* under the chin. At laſt we perceive he is writing with ideas clear enough to himſelf, perhaps, who had the vizor immediately before his eyes, but dark to every one elſe. He is deſcribing *a head engraved* on "this vizor of exquiſite workmanſhip in Corinthian braſs."

"XXII. *Obſervations on the* Griggirry *of the* Mandingos. *From* Elliott Arthy, Eſq."

Theſe are pieces of manuſcript worn by the Mandingos, a tribe of Africans "ſituated about one hundred miles to the northward of the Britiſh colony at Sierra Leone. They are commonly folded into a ſmall compaſs, and incloſed in little leathern caſes, to which are fixed leathern thongs; by means of which they are hung, and conſtantly worn, round either the necks or waiſts of the Mandingos. A Mandingo man, poſſeſſing one of them, conceives himſelf ſecure *from* all harm whatever; not only *from* all kinds of diſeaſes and miſhaps, but even *from* being carried captive *from* his country, and ſhielded moreover *from* the deathful force of a bullet when ſhot *from* a muſquet. There appears to me a very ſtriking analogy between the Griggirry of the Mandingos and the Taliſman of the Arabians; and I conceive it to be very probable, that the Mandingos did originally receive, and may perhaps even at this time obtain and be taught to compoſe, their Griggirrys by the Arabians; with whom, though very far diſtant, they are ſaid to have frequent intercourſe. The truth of my conjecture, however, reſts *with* [on] comparing the incloſed piece of manuſcript *with* ſome known Arabic characters, or ſhewing it to ſome perſon converſant in the Arabic language."

A note adds what carries this probable ſuggeſtion into actual certainty:

"Dr.

" Dr. Ruſſel ſays, that this paper is written *in* the Arabic hand uſed *in* Barbary, and contains the name of God frequently repeated, with the addition of certain unintelligible characters. Charms of this kind are much uſed by the Mahometans. See Ruſſel's Hiſt. of Aleppo, vol. ii. p. 103."

" XXIII. *Diſſertations on the Lives and Works of ſeveral* Anglo-Norman *Poets of the thirteenth century. From* Monſ. De la Rue."

This worthy Frenchman having, in two diſſertations, treated already upon the writings and lives of ſome of theſe Anglo Norman poets in the 12th and 13th centuries, now paſſes on to thoſe wholly in the thirteenth. He thus opens a new volume of intelligence to us: and we therefore feel a ſtrong deſire of encouraging him in it. Yet we can notice the eſſay, from the very nature of it, in a ſlight manner only.

Archbiſhop Langton of 1207 " has inſerted in one of them" his ſermons, " *ſtanza of a ſong*, which ſeems dictated by the Graces; and, if found in any other ſituation, it would appear to form a compliment delicately made to ſome beauty. I acknowledge that when I firſt read them, [it], my ſurprize made me return [turn back] to the title of the ſermon, *that* I might be ſure *that* I was not miſtaken.* But no: it truly is in his ſermon on the Holy Virgin, that this prelate has placed the ſtanza. The orator then enforces each particular verſe, and applies it myſtically to the Holy Virgin. The allegorical turn, which he gives to the whole of the ſtanza, is very happily handled. There can be no doubt, that the taſte for French poetry muſt have been at that time very general in England; ſince the metropolitan of the kingdom thought to conciliate to himſelf more eaſily the attention of his auditors, by taking this poetic flight; and he muſt have himſelf been well perſuaded, that it neither violated the rules of rhetorick then received, nor the dignity of his miniſtry; ſince he did not think it below him to inſert in his diſcourſe a ſonnet, which in itſelf preſents no other than ideas entirely of an amorous nature. But we have already ſeen, that in the preceding century Guernes de Pont St. Maxence had pronounced, in the metropolitan cathedral of Canterbury, the life of Thomas a Becket in French verſe;† ſo that the diſcourſe of Stephen of Langton contains nothing unuſual; and many other examples of ſermons in verſe may be found, by thoſe who ſtudy the hiſtory of the Anglo-Norman poets."

The introduction of a poetical addreſs to the Virgin Mary in a ſermon, would certainly ſound very ſtrange to the ears even of the moſt impaſſioned auditors at preſent. Nor have even the moſt impaſſioned liſtened with eagerneſs to any addreſſes in a ſermon, even proſaical addreſſes, to the Virgin Mary, to the heavenly angels, or to any of the Perſons in the Trinity. Our oratory, cold as the froſts of our clime, and creeping on in the languor of our ſpirits, never kindles into any flame, and never riſes into any elevation, above the general

---

* This is tranſlated from the French; *by whom* is not ſaid, but apparently by one who attended not to the French idiom.

† " Archæologia, vol. xii."

warmth

warmth of common converſation, and above the level line of common addreſſes. Any thing extraordinary, from the flight of the fancy out of time into eternity, from the excurſion of the mind beyond this dim ſpot of earth into the world of ſpirits, the abode of good men and women diſembodied, or the reſidence of both in heaven, never raiſes one finger of emotion, never heightens one tongue of rapture, and never throws the preacher into one tranſport of proper enthuſiaſm, among ourſelves. Are we placed too far north for ſuch ſenſibilities? Yet, ſurely we may ſay with Lord Oxford upon another occaſion

" Haud tam averſus equos Tyriâ ſol jungit ab urbe."

" *Chardry.* Odericus Vitalis aſſerts, that the Norman minſtrels in the twelfth century celebrated the lives of ſaints in French verſe; * and it is worthy of obſervation, that from thoſe ſtill exiſting it is clear, the poets ſet apart theſe holy poems for eccleſiaſtical feſtivals and ſabbaths; † and that they kept for the other days of the week all their compoſitions on profane ſubjects. ‡ Chardry was one of thoſe poets who exerciſed their genius on ſubjects of devotion; and we have from him the life of St. Joſaphat, and that of the Seven Sleepers (brethren)," but " not of St. Dormans, as improperly printed by Mr. Warton," both " in French verſe. The Life of the Seven Sleeping Brethren contains more than one thouſand eight hundred verſes."

The author next introduces *William of Wadington.*

" The name of this poet ſufficiently announces his origin; and he himſelf informs us that he was born in England.—Judging from his ſtyle, he lived, I believe," *rather* I believe he lived, " about the middle of the thirteenth century. In the firſt place, he treats of the general taſte of the Engliſh for romances of knight-errantry, for fabulous tales, and ſongs; and he blames them only, becauſe they employed themſelves in the reading of theſe works on the *Sabbath.* Another kind of poeſy, called *Rotewange,* was much in requeſt among them; and we believe that it conſiſted of pieces which they ſang, and at the ſame time accompanied themſelves on the hurdy gurdy. But thoſe theatrical pieces called *Miracles,* were their delight beyond all others; they were of the nature of tragedy; which repreſented the martyrdom of ſome ſaint of the primitive church. Geoffrey, abbot of St. Alban's, had introduced into England the taſte for thoſe theatrical pieces, as early as the beginning of the twelfth century. § By Fitz-Stephen's account, it continued in force to the end of that century; and the city of London was the place before all others, famous for this kind of repreſentation. ‖ But the evidence of Waddington proves, that the interval till his day had greatly increaſed this taſte among the Engliſh. From what he ſpecifies on the ſubject of theſe entertainments, it ſeems that they were ſometimes brought forward in the public places, but moſt commonly in burial grounds. They

---

" * Oder. Vit. apud Duchene, p. 598 "

† With ſurprize do we read this word for Sunday, in a French author.

" ‡ Warton's Hiſt. of Engliſh Poetry."

" § Math. Paris in vitâ abbatum Sti. Albani."

" ‖ Fitz-Stephen's Deſcription of London, p. 73."

borrowed,

borrowed, as had been uſual with Geoffrey of St. Alban's,* the ornaments of the church to decorate their theatre. It was always in the afternoon that theſe *miracles* were repreſented. Women in particular thronged to them from all quarters; the entertainment was often concluded by dances; ſometimes by wreſtling or tilting, a kind of play, which exerciſed the body, and was much in vogue among the Engliſh. Our poet lays great blame on theſe entertainments, theſe dances, and recreations; more particularly when they engroſſed a part of the *Sabbath*. There is good reaſon to believe, that the clerks who were the authors were alſo the performers of theſe theatrical pieces."

In confirmation of this conjecture we produce a paſſage out of Stowe's Survey of London, that was unknown to this recent *Ruæus*, and yet is very ſatisfactory.

"*Clarkes Well* or *Clarkenwell*," ſays our very uſeful topographer, "tooke name of the pariſh clarks in London, who (of old time) were *accustomed* there *yeerely to assemble*, and to *play some large historie of holy scripture*. For example of later time, to wit, in the yeere 1390, the 14 of Richard the Second, I read that the pariſh clarks of London on the 18th of July, *plaid interludes* at *Skinners Well* neere unto *Clarkes Well*; which play *continued three dayes together*, the *king*, *queene*, and *nobles* being *present*. Alſo the yeere 1409, the tenth of Henry the Fourth, *they played a play* at the *Skinners Well*, which *lasted eight days*, and was *of matter from the creation of the world*; there were to ſee the ſame, the *moſt* part of the *nobles* and *gentles* in *England*, *&c.* other ſmaller wels were many neere unto *Clarkes Well*; namely *Skinners Well*, ſo called for that the ſkinners of London *held* there *certain plays*, *yearly plaid* of holy ſcripture, &c. *In place whereof* the wreſtlings," which appear from M. De La Rue above, to have been only the epilogue (as it were) to the plays, "have of latter yeeres beene kept," to the ſuperſedence of the plays themſelves, "and is in part continued at Bartholomewtide." †

This extract reflects a light upon Monſ. De La Rue's, and receives a light from it. But, as the author goes on concerning the clerks as authors,

"To embelliſh their works they gave ample ſcope to their imaginations; and the more marvellous their production, the more certainty of applauſe. Wadington, nevertheleſs, forbids his readers to give faith to theſe prodigies falſely attributed to the ſaints; and conſiders the authors of theſe theatrical pieces as no other than madmen. But that which principally raiſes his indignation, is the uſe of diſguiſes," without which no play can poſſibly be acted, but "with which they," though only a few in number, "were able to repreſent the whole number *of* the different characters of their pieces. It does not clearly appear in what they conſiſted." Yet our author has himſelf told us before, that "they borrowed, as had been uſual with Geoffry of St. Albans, the ornaments of the church to decorate their theatre."

Theſe indeed are ſaid by him to have been "the ornaments of the *church*," and to have been uſed in order "to decorate their *theatre*."

"* Math. Paris loco citato." "† P. xi. edit. 1633."

But

But they are ſo ſaid inaccurately concerning both, and the inaccuracy there has generated the contradiction here. They were merely perſonal ornaments, and merely perſonal decorations. This appears from the very paſſage, to which a reference is made concerning Geoffry.

" Apud Duneſtapliam," ſays Paris, " quendam ludum de Sanctâ Catherinâ (quem *miracula* vulgariter appellamus) fecit; *ad quæ decorandas* petiit a ſacriſtâ ſancti albani, ut ſibi *capæ corales* accomadarentur; et obtinuit." †

The diſguiſes then were evidently dreſſes, calculated for the different characters that were to be perſonated.

" He ſays poſitively, that they diſguiſed their faces; but whether this was by maſks, or merely by colours, or (in ſhort) by putting on the form of voracious animals, to which the martyrs were often expoſed, is a ſubject on which the author ſays nothing ſufficiently clear, for us to form a preciſe and determinate opinion."

They muſt certainly have aſſumed the form of beaſts, when they were to worry the martyr. They muſt equally have worn maſks, when they were to perſonate different characters in the ſame play. And they muſt at times perhaps have coloured over their faces, as our players colour theirs in a Sir Toby Belch, or a Sir Andrew Aguecheek. But all theſe diſguiſes, it ſeems, greatly raiſed the indignation of Waddington. He was plainly, therefore, a puritan by anticipation. And we have known ſuch men in our own days, not indeed poets but proſemen, not actuated by any flame of poetic fire, but ſpeaking in all the frigidity of proſe, againſt any diſguiſe whatever, proſcribing all plays from the very neceſſity of diſguiſes in them, and condemning all diſguiſes as directly tending to immorality becauſe they may ſo tend accidentally. Every act, even the beſt of actions, may ſo tend equally. But, indeed, the notion is too ridiculous for refutation, and the Quaker who burnt his wig as a diſguiſe, was not more ridiculous in practice.

The author ſays, " that he ſhould not have undertaken to tranſlate his work into French verſe, but to make it more palateable to a nation that purſued with avidity every thing written in *that* language:" a ſtroke concerning our national character then, as novel as it is amuſing! " And to the end, (continues he) that it might be underſtood as well by the great as by the lower claſs of people:" as if the " great" underſtood not Engliſh, and as if " the lower claſs" actually underſtood French even in dialogue! Surely this can never be true as ſtated. As the lower muſt certainly have underſtood Engliſh, ſo the higher muſt as certainly have been the perſons who underſtood French. And Monſ. De La Rue, or his tranſlator, have undoubtedly miſſed the meaning.

The author then goes on to other writers, but we cannot attend

---

" * P. 1007. Watts."

him any further; and can only thank him very cordially now, for the information he has given us.

" XXIV. *A Short Chronological Account of the* Religious Eſtabliſhments *made by* Engliſh Catholics *on the Continent of* Europe. *By* the Abbé Mann."

The 42, 43, and 44 of theſe were " Carmelites, or Tereſian nuns, at Antwerp, Lier, and Hoogſtræte." Thoſe of Antwerp have ſettled unknown (we believe) to the Abbé, at Lanherne, a houſe belonging to Lord Arundel, in Cornwall, and ſituated in the pariſh of Mawgan, near St. Columb there.

" XXV. *Extracts from the Pariſh Regiſter of* St. Bennet's, St. Paul's Wharf, London. *Communicated by* the Rev. Mark Nobbs, F. A. S."

" XXVI. *Obſervations on a* Greek *Sepulchral Monument in the poſſeſſion of* Maxwell Garthſhore, M. D. F. R. S. and F. A. S. *By* Tayler Combe, Eſq. F. A. S.

" XXVII. *A Deſcription of the Church of* Melbourne, *in* Derbyſhire, *with an Attempt to explain from it the real Situation of the* Porticus *in the ancient Churches. By* William Wilkins, Eſq. F. A. S."

This eſſay contains *principally* an attempt to ſettle " the real ſituation of the *porticus* in the ancient churches."

In this attempt the author cites a variety of paſſages from " Mr. Bentham, in his learned and ingenious remarks on the hiſtory of Saxon churches; and, as it is a work to which future antiquaries will frequently refer, and on whoſe authority they may with good confidence rely, *and* more particularly affording aſſiſtance in the inveſtigation of Gothic remains, I hope it will not betray too much preſumption to controvert ſome opinions in the courſe of the work, or too much vanity to attempt a cenſure where ſo little opportunity is offered to the ſeverity of criticiſm."

We think not ſo highly of Mr. Bentham's hiſtory, and have read many cenſures upon it in *manuſcript*. We have particularly read one upon the very point which Mr. Wilkins is here handling. And all of them will ſoon be publiſhed, we underſtand, in a work entitled The Œconomy of our Antient Churches exemplified in the Antient Cathedral of Cornwall.

" From theſe paſſages of Mr. Bentham's Hiſtory," notes Mr. Wilkins, " it is evident that he miſconceives the ſituation of the *porticus* in theſe antient churches; and with Mr. Collier, in his Church Hiſtory, he is equally erroneous in his inferences, who has miſtaken the *porticus* for the porch. It does not appear that either of them were aware *that* the porches to our preſent churches are of modern adoption; indeed they are not to be found but of Gothic workmanſhip. We never find the porches of the *Saxon* or of the *Norman* ſtyle; and they are generally, though not always, placed againſt the ſides of the north and the ſouth aiſles, whereas the portico of theſe more ancient churches are [is] a part of the principal building, divided from the nave by arches, as in the inſtance of this church at Melbourne, where a continuity of roof covers the whole. It is evident enough *from* all the quotations *from* Bede, the Chron. Saxon, the Monaſt. Angl. &c. &c." as recited

recited by Mr. Bentham in p. 18—20, and repeated from him by Mr. Wilkins here, "that the *porticus* does not mean the porch, nor indeed any part of the SIDE-ISLES, as Mr. Bentham has conceived; and they clearly evince that the porticos, though not large, were not an inconſiderable portion of the buildings; and if the plan *of* the porticus *of* Melbourne church be conſulted, there can be no difficulty in determining that Bede's account is ſufficiently juſt, explanatory, and *perfectly conſiſtent*, although 'he ſays nothing in direct terms either of pillars or arches;'* and we ought not therefore to conclude, with Mr. Bentham, *that Bede* in this inſtance *is at all ſparing in his deſcription of his churches*, which probably had neither PILLARS nor SIDE-ISLES. And if the weſt-end of the churches [which] he deſcribes, were divided off like this at Melbourne for the *porticus*, it is alſo probable they were [this end was] ſubdivided in like manner into ſmaller portions, and each portion or portico was dedicated to a favourite ſaint." Mr. Wilkins then cites another paſſage from Mr. Bentham's hiſtory, and adds, that "theſe paſſages," he conſidered them as ſeveral combined into one, "very clearly fix the entrance into the churches *at one end*, and of courſe the end oppoſite to the chancel; and as diſtinctly point out the ſituation of the porticus, through which was the entrance."†

Mr. Wilkins accordingly gives us a neat ground plan of the church, with its "north portico," its "middle portico," and its "ſouth portico;" but adds to this a fine "ſection" of the church, with its double tier of windows; both engraved by Baſire. Mr. Wilkins thus coincides with Mr. Collier, in conſidering the porticus of our old authors as the porch ſtill; and only fixes the porch as a continuation of the church at the weſt end of the whole. But will this portico anſwer any better than the porch, to *Bede*'s account particularly? King Ethelbert "was buried, ſays Bede, *in portica Sancti Martini intra eccleſiam*; which ſhews," as Mr. Bentham argues juſtly, "that the porticus was within the church."‡ Mr. Wilkins accordingly ſtates *his* portico to be within the church originally, as the "walls, which at this time ſhut out the communication of the porticos with the church," are ſtated to have been open arches originally.§ Yet this is rather an evaſion than an anſwer. And what ſhall we ſay to another extract from Mr. Bentham's hiſtory, in Mr. Wilkins's own notes?

"In the year 674 Biſhop Wilfrid began the foundation of this celebrated church (St. Andrew's at Heſcham); and Eddius ſpeaks with great admiration of it in this manner: 'its deep foundations, and *the many ſubterraneous rooms* there artfully diſpoſed, all of hewn ſtone, and *ſupported by* ſundry kinds of pillars and *many porticos*,—and the turnings of *the paſſages*, ſometimes *aſcending* or *deſcending* by *winding ſtairs* to the different parts of the building."‖

This undoubtedly delineates a church very different in form from

---

* Hiſt. of Ely, p. 18. † P. 298, 299, 300.
‡ Mr. Wilkins's own citation, 295. § P. 307. ‖ P. 292.

Melbourne, and diſpoſes its porticos in a very different place from Mr. Wilkins's. The porticos united with the pillars to *ſupport* the building, as being "*ſubterraneous* rooms," and "*many*" in number; as having "paſſages ſometimes aſcending or" ſometimes "deſcending by winding ſtairs" to or from them. And the words of Eddius, as cited by Mr. Bentham himſelf, are ſtill ſtronger: "ſuper terram" or above ground Wilfrid built "multiplicem domum" the large ſtructure of the church, "columnis variis *et porticibus* multis *ſuffultam.*"* We could wiſh to add more upon the ſubject, but we withold our hand, becauſe we derive our information from a manuſcript that we think it wrong to anticipate. Nor need we to add any more, as what we have ſaid is ſufficient to refute both Mr. Bentham's and Mr. Wilkins's opinions upon the point. The reſt we muſt leave to the reverend antiquary, when he chooſes to publiſh. We only ſubjoin one remark upon another ſubject.

"It is very probable," cries Mr. Wilkins like a true antiquary, who draws every thing poſſible to be drawn into the *vortex* of his own ideas, and fancies every point of hiſtory to be bearing upon his own object, "that this church was built about that time or perhaps ſoon after, by Penda's ſon King Etheldred, who married Oſſride the youngeſt daughter of King Oſwy, anno 677. The intermarriages of the kings of Mercia with the daughters of the king of Northumberland, and *the conditions of their embracing Chriſtianity*, are circumſtances which with others corroborate the idea, of this church's having been founded here about that time. The Saxon coins of king Edwine who began his reign A. D. 617, and of king Etheland A. D. 726, bear in the center a croſs between four points, *exactly corresponding with the ornaments of a capital of one of the pillars* towards the weſt end; which appears to have been a very favourite ornament, adopted *on the converſion of the Saxon kings to Chriſtianity.*"†

Such an argument as this for the age of a church, very frivolous in itſelf, is repelled at once by a fact. The ſilver pennies of William the Conqueror, coined at Rouen before the conqueſt, have juſt the ſame kind of croſs and points imprinted upon them.‡

"XXVIII. *Enquiries concerning the Tomb of* King Alfred *at* Hyde Abbey, *near* Wincheſter. By Henry Howard, Eſq."

In theſe enquiries we eagerly unite with the author, and with the author lament feelingly our diſappointment. "The inſide of the church, which ſtood on ſpringy ground, was eaſily diſtinguiſhed by its being laid with ſtrong beaten clay to the depth of nearly four feet, the whole forming an oblong ſquare, encloſed by the foundations and the rubbiſh." The foundations ſurely are deciſive ſignatures of the extent. Yet "an oblong ſquare" is ſo ſtrange a form for a church built only under Henry the firſt, that we are ſtartled at it. Nor does

---

* Bentham, p. 22. † P. 292, 308.

‡ Ducarrel's Anglo-Norman Antiquities, plate 3.

this

this configuration agree with the actual dimenſions of the church, as they were formerly meaſured in a more certain manner from the very walls then ſtanding. "The church," ſays the Hiſtory of Wincheſter publiſhed in 1773, and vainly reported in ſome trick of the bookſellers at the time (we remember) to have been written by the Rev. Mr. Thomas Warton, "which was built with flint caſed with ſtone, *appears from its ruins* to have *conſiſted* of *three iles*, and to have been at leaſt *two hundred and forty feet long*." * This ſhews there has been ſome great miſtake committed, by either Mr. Howard or his informant. "The point *a* appeared to him," as Mr. Howard adds concerning the other, "nearly the centre of the clay taken from north to ſouth, of which there was [were] about fourteen yards on each ſide. From *a* eaſtward to *b*," at the termination of the clay, "he ſuppoſed twenty-four yards; and from thence the rubbiſh and foundations," but not the clay, "extended ſome yards farther." All theſe meaſures from *a*, as "nearly the centre of the clay," give us a length of twenty-four yards to the eaſt, and of as many to the weſt, with a width of twice fourteen; of eighty-four feet for the breadth of the nave and two aiſles, yet only of a hundred and forty-four feet in the length, nearly one whole hundred of feet too ſhort. This meaſure therefore is wrong, and the church extended on the weſt (as indeed Mr. Howard's own plan ſuggeſts) much longer than from *a* to the eaſt. "About *d* and *d* there were two paths of clay nearly ſix feet wide, one ending to the north *in* a ſpot *in* which the clay was laid *in* a ſquariſh ſhape, and about which there were alſo ruins of foundations. This, I conceive, may have been the ſacriſty; the other path to the ſouth, at the termination of which much rubbiſh is to be ſeen, probably led to the cloiſters," &c. There were evidently the two arms of the croſs, that ended each in a chapel below, with a tower between them above, and that divided the nave from the chancel. At the centre between theſe arms, or "at *b*," as Mr. Howard ſpeaks, "there were remains of a ſolid baſis of maſonry, and fragments of ſeveral ſmall columns of Purbeck marble. Part of one of theſe I have obtained. It is ornamented in a ſpiral direction, with two animals coupled together on one ſide, and rudely carved flowers on the other. May not this have been part of the high altar?" This was the acceſs under the tower from the nave into the quire. Nor was the high altar placed at any point but the very eaſtern termination of the whole. This altar, therefore, was placed at *b* in fact. *There*, alſo, as we are ſure from Leland's teſtimony, were depoſited the bones of Alfred. "In this ſuburbe," ſays Leland, "ſtoode the *great* abbaye of Hyde, and [it] hath yet a paroche chirche. The bones of Alfredus king of the Weſt Saxons, and of Edward his ſunne and king, were layid in A TUMBE BEFORE THE HIGH ALTARE at Hyde; in the *which tumbe* was *a late* found 2 *litle tables of leade in-*

* Vol. I. p. 15.

ſcribid with theyr names."* Nor can any diſcoveries made in the *nave* have any relation to Alfred. "About *a* was found," ſays Mr. Howard in a purſuit the more blind as the more raſh, "a ſtone coffin caſed with lead both within and without, *and* containing ſome bones and remains of garments. The lead in its decayed ſtate ſold for two guineas; the bones were thrown about, and the ſtone coffin broken into pieces. There were two other coffins, and no more, found in this part; which were alſo, for the ſake of the garden," annexed to the New Gaol or Bridewell, erected in 1788 upon the ſite of the very church, and "in which they lay, broken and buried as low as the ſpring," that has always infeſted this meadow of Hyde, that is only two feet below the level of the ground,† and that has cauſed the floor of the church to be raiſed by clay "nearly four feet" above this level. The "ſtone coffin caſed with lead both within and without," Mr. Howard would willingly hope to have been Alfred's.—"May not this," he aſks, "have been part of the tomb of Alfred?" Certainly not, becauſe that tomb was at the high altar in the quire, and this is merely in the nave. "Poſſibly the two other coffins," he adds, "contained the remains of Edward and of Queen Alſwitha."‡ *In an hiſtorical view* they *cannot*, *poſſibly*, as the bones only of Alfred and his ſon Edward were tranſlated from Wincheſter to Hyde, and as theſe were depoſited before the high altar on the eaſt. "Farther weſt, as in *gg*," ſubjoins Mr. Howard, "many ſtone coffins were found, *and the clay extended to oo*," ſtill farther weſt; "the ſituation and number of coffins denote this to have been the nave [the extremity of the nave] of the church.—Further *eaſt* than *b*" where *we* are clear the high altar ſtood, "were great numbers of ſtone coffins, and ſome rather more ſouth, *juſt beyond*; but *in this part there was no clay*; and, being beyond the traces of the foundations, we may conclude that it was the church yard."§ We thus end with a ſatisfaction peculiar to antiquaries, perhaps, that amidſt all the devaſtations of ſacrilege, amidſt all the deſolations of time, the remains of Alfred, which continued "in a tumbe before the high altare" as late as the days of Leland, had even had "a late found" in the tomb "2 litle tables of leade inſcribid with theyr names," and are actually ſtill at reſt though the tomb has been deſtroyed. So little is it requiſite for hearts moſt in love with Alfred, to "feel ſome ſhare of that indignation," which Mr. Howard erroneouſly felt, "when I inform you," he ſays, "that the aſhes of the great Alfred, after having been ſcattered about by the rude hands of convicts," employed in building this bridewell or jail, "are now probably covered by a building erected for their confinement and puniſhment."¶ That "this ſmall field" ſhould have been "purchaſed by the county," and that "in it they"

---

* Vol. 3. p. 102. † Arch. xiii. 310. ‡ P. 311.
§ P. 312. ¶ P. 309—310.

ſhould

ſhould have "erected the new Gaol or Bridewell,"* is perhaps to be deplored by all men of taſte or ſenſibility. But we muſt conſider coolly who *they* are, that ſo direct a county. They are in general men of ſlight education, capable of acting properly in the common buſineſs of life as magiſtrates, but utterly incapable of looking back with ſenſibility upon paſt monarchs, and utterly inſenſible therefore of any delicacy due to their remains. "When you are told," ſubjoins Mr. Howard, "that this occurred ſo late as the year 1788, and that no one in the neighbourhood," not the biſhop, not a clergyman under him, not even Mr. Milner, "led either by curioſity or veneration for his remains, attempted to diſcover or reſcue them from this ignoble fate; your ſurpriſe," he ſays, as he ſpeaks to George Nayler, Eſq. York Herald, "will not (I think) be leſs than my own."† Yet for the comfort of Mr. Nayler, Mr. Howard, Mr. Milner, or even any of the clergy of the cathedral, let us remark, that the place where Alfred and Edward were entombed has never yet been violated, that their remains ſtill reſt in peace at the foot of the ground on which the high altar ſtood, and that we hope, if no clergyman of the church of England interpoſes from his reverence for either or for both, yet Mr. Milner will interpoſe from his reſpect for the relicks of ſuch a ſaint as Alfred, to ſave them from being diſturbed by the ſpade of the gardener, and (as we could almoſt wiſh) to ſecure them from diſturbance by a monument over them. We therefore thank Mr. Howard, who is a military gentleman accidentally quartered at Wincheſter, for giving us an opportunity of ſuggeſting this to the public.

"XXIX. *Copy of a curious record of Pardon in the* Tower *of* London. *Communicated by* Thomas Aſtle, Eſq."

"XXX. *Copy of an original Manuſcript entitled* 'A Breviate touching the order and governmente of a Nobleman's houſe.' *Communicated by the Right Hon.* Sir Joſeph Banks, Bart, K. B. P. R. S. and F. S. A."

This ſeems to prove, that the *buttery* in our houſes meant originally where "beare and hogſheades are of ſtore" in butt,‡ and to mark our *coverpain* for "a fine ſquare cloath of cambricke called a coverpaine," as ordered "to *cover* the *breade*" when ſet upon the table previous to dinner.§ We had many other obſervations, but cannot afford room for them, as we have laid out ſo large a portion of our review upon the articles preceding.

On the ſame principle we cannot ſtop at the Appendix which comes next. Nor can we add more, than that we think the whole ſo much like life well ſpent, as will not allow us to condemn it in general becauſe it has many excellencies, or to applaud it in general becauſe it has many deficiencies, but to conſider it on the whole as leſs perfect than we wiſhed it to be, and yet more perfect than we expected to find it.

---

* P. 310. † P. 310. ‡ 329. § P. 334.

Rees's *New Cyclopædia.*

(Continued from Vol. XII. P. 190.)

WHEN we began our critique upon this article we felt that we were about to fulfil one of the moſt imperious obligations of our duty as Anti-Jacobins. We were called to it by the voice of public appeal, of public reprobation; but our pen "*nullius addictus jurare in verba magiſtri*" was ſuſpended until we had tried the work before us by that teſt which we at the commencement of our labours, declared to be the "*norma loquendi*" of our office as Reviewers. It is unneceſſary for us to recapitulate what that was, but it is ſufficient to obſerve that whatever has appeared boldly or inſidiouſly, in word, deed, or deſign, to militate againſt the eſtabliſhment of theſe realms in church or ſtate, has been ſure to meet with our decided oppoſition; and this we aſſert on the broadeſt principle of conſiſtency has uniformly conſtituted the tenor of our labours. As Reviewers therefore we owe no other account to thoſe authors who by the conſtruction of their works bring on themſelves our cenſure, than what thoſe works anticipate us in. In them, therefore, let their reſpective writers who conceive themſelves aggrieved read our reaſons for that cenſure. We do not judge it neceſſary or in any degree incumbent upon us to delay the performance of our duty a ſingle inſtant by digreſſions of elaborate vindication. Our principles are grounded on the firmeſt baſis of impartial truth. That conſtitution which every honeſt ſubject has ſworn to defend, and which is framed in the moſt perfect mould of religious and civil polity, forms the ſtandard of our ſentiments. Its natural and preſcriptive rights we are reſolved to maintain with all our might againſt the attempts of thoſe who ſeem to be equally reſolved to deſtroy. The matter has been long at iſſue between us, and there is reaſon, good reaſon, to conclude, that on our ſide of the queſtion no ground has been loſt. We will now return to this part of the conteſt in which we have to encounter the main ſtrength of the enemy's hoſt, drawn up in all the formidable array of that ſolid column of attack, *an Encyclopædia.*

We obſerved in our laſt number that we conſidered the principles of this work as the moſt important object of our concern, becauſe the work itſelf is already iſſuing from the preſs, and will in its preſent form of publication continue to do ſo for ſeveral years before it can be completed. Were we, therefore, to wait till all its component parts ſhould be united in the one vaſt whole, the miſchief which it behoves us to endeavour to obviate would be effected, its deſign would be perfected, its ſucceſs ſecured. This would therefore involve us in reproach as being guilty of a ſupineneſs unworthy of ourſelves and of the cauſe we have eſpouſed. With reſpect to moſt of the ſcientific parts we do not heſitate a moment in declaring it as our opinion that the editor appears to have availed himſelf of much modern matter,

well

well ſelected from the recent publications on the ſeveral ſubjects which have hitherto eſcaped his mutilating plan of arrangement, and have preſerved to themſelves a connection of diſcuſſion. The botanical part, as far as we have ſeen hitherto, is peculiarly accurate, explanatory and ſatisfactory. In the phyſiological department, the article "Abſorption," though briefly, and we think rather too briefly, treated, is in other reſpects well put together. It is a ſubject of too much importance, however, in the animal economy not to have deſerved a regular diſquiſition, inſtead of a confined compendium. Several very ingenious and very intelligent treatiſes have been lately written upon it which would have furniſhed ample materials for the compiler: that publiſhed by Dr. Fullarton would have afforded a very concluſive and inſtructive extract. In the article of "Acceleration" we find a very ſtriking inſtance of the inconvenient and "mutilating" ſyſtem of arranging the various ſubjects in diviſions and ſubdiviſions, and not under their principal heads. We have here no leſs than eight different references to other parts of the Dictionary. "Accent" is the beſt ſupported ſubject we have met with throughout the *Firſt Part*; and we are free to acknowledge that it is as copious a compilation as the nature of the editor's plan can admit of: it is very accurately digeſted, the authorities are judiciouſly ſelected, and the ſeveral opinions juſtly applied. We do not, however, altogether coincide with the editor, or rather with his authority Mr. A. Browne, in the remark attached to the concluſion of this article—that, "we are greatly miſtaken in our idea of the ſuppoſed lofty ſound of πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλασσης, as the borderers on the coaſt of the Archipelago take their ideas from the gentle laving of the ſhore by a ſummer wave, and not from the roaring of a winter ocean, and they accordingly pronounced it *Polyphliſveo Thalaſſes.*" This ſuggeſtion, which we are informed, aroſe in the mind of the ingenious writer upon Greek accent from his converſation with the modern Greeks, is, we think, ſomewhat more erroneous than the prevailing ſcholaſtic acceptation of the lofty ſound of theſe two words. The modern Greeks, like the modern Romans, have dwindled from their former elevated boldneſs of national characteriſtic, into mental enervation and perſonal effeminacy, and their reſpective languages have undergone the ſame mutation in their tones; the ancient nervous grandeur of which is now loſt in a debilitating attenuation, the ſtrong aſpirate is ſunk in a liſp, and the ſoul commanding accents of a Demoſthenes and a Cicero with which they thundered conviction upon the minds of their hearers, are no longer heard among their degenerate deſcendants. We are, therefore, more inclined to impute this ſoftened pronunciation to modern corruption, than to receive it as a teſtimony of any error in the long accepted appropriation of the ſound to the ſenſe, or in our ideas of that deſignation of local character which the bard intended to convey; for the ſhores of the Archipelago are in the winter no more free from ſurges than any other. Beſides the very compoſition of πολυφλοίσβος evidently expreſſes more than the gentle laving of the ſummer wave.

It

It appears to us that the difference lies materially in the modern inhabitants of theſe ſhores pronouncing the Greek β like our v. They alſo alter the quantity of the word θαλασσης, and pronounce it as if written *Thallaſis*. We do not conceive that the modern Greek accent is in this caſe deſerving of more conſideration than the quantity.

Of the biography we cannot ſpeak highly, it is not what biography ought to be, it is not impartial. It is alſo uſed as a medium of ſcepticiſm where it deſcribes ſcriptural characters. We have given proof of this in the lives of Aaron and Abraham, but in that of the former our obſervation is more eſpecially ſubſtantiated. We have alſo had occaſion to remark in the editor, a kind of politico-theological inclination to applaud the conduct of men of congenial principles with his own, and to inſinuate diſadvantageouſly of others whoſe opinions and lives happen to be of oppoſite tendency. Of this partial diſtribution of his praiſe and blame we have already pointed out an example, and we ſee before us much increaſing cauſe for our remark.

Although, therefore, we willingly admit the merit of the compilation of ſuch articles as form that ſolitary part of it, which from the very nature of its contents is altogether inſulated from the contaminating influence of editorial prejudice, we cannot honeſtly go farther. For if it is to be preſumed that the progreſs of ſcience advances the perſonal comfort of mankind, and that whatſoever tends to involve the mind in doubt and infidel diſtraction deſtroys it, the latter when ſuffered to commix with the former muſt counteract its beneficial effect, and too often ſubſtitute its own deſtructive conſequences. A work, therefore, that under the pretext of promoting ſcientific knowledge, is made uſe of as a medium for the diſſemination of the principles of the ſchiſmatic, however perfect in ſome of its parts altogether independent of its main deſign, is not what we can or ought to recommend, but is to all intents and purpoſes ſuch a work as every friend to the beſt intereſts of human nature muſt reprobate and reject.

There are few inquirers into the deep things of nature, however abſtruſe their reſearches, but who have ſometime or other looked up to nature's GOD. There are few perſons, however well ſtored their minds may be in all the ſuperior acquiſitions of literature, but who are ſometimes induced to return to the reading of their infancy, and meditate on the contents of their bible; and we will be bold to add, that the wonder of the former with which they viewed the creature, has been abſorbed in the adoration of the miraculous power and love of the Creator; and that the ſelf-reference and importance with which the latter have regarded the attainment of human learning have ſunk into a correcting humility of ſoul when they have thought upon the divine origin of the ſcriptures, and pondered upon their conditions of reward and puniſhment. Whatever, therefore, or whoever labours to ſeparate the philoſopher from the Chriſtian, or learning from an humble conviction of intellectual dependency upon the word of GOD, is inimical and in the worſt ſenſe of the word hoſtile

to

to the pureſt ſatisfactions of the human heart, and ſubverſive of its happieſt hopes. For true philoſophy cannot ſubſiſt without religion, and ſcience is imperfect without the knowledge of GOD. The one, therefore, cannot be inculcated or promoted independent of the other; whence it appears that the infidel cannot be a philoſopher, nor the man of doubt a man of ſcience; and the work that profeſſes to teach philoſophy without religion, or ſcience without Chriſtian belief, is not to be recommended to thoſe who would become either true philoſophers or men of ſcientific ability.—But to return to our review.

Under the word "Acre," that word of gall to the Corſican chieftain of France, we meet with the following reflection upon the Britiſh arms: "Notwithſtanding the ſingular ſpirit and very extraordinary exertions manifeſted in this ſiege, both by the aſſailants and the beſieged, humanity on both ſides muſt lament the aggravated circumſtances of cruelty and diſtreſs that attended it." This is a ſtigma conveyed under that ſtale pretext of "humanity" againſt the intrepid commander of intrepid Engliſhmen in that ever memorable defeat of Buonaparte. The expreſſion as it ſtands is vague, "humanity on *both ſides*," ſays the editor, "muſt lament the *aggravated* circumſtances of *cruelty* and diſtreſs that attended it." The following is evidently the drift of this ſentence; "humanity muſt lament the aggravated circumſtances of cruelty on both ſides." This reflection muſt not be permitted to deſcend to poſterity, "ſi conata efficere poſſit," without ſome qualification of fact. The laurels of Britons throughout the whole of this arduous conteſt were in *no* inſtance ſtained by *cruelty*. The hero of Acre poſſeſſed a ſoul far above puſillanimous revenge or needleſs ſlaughter. He knew how to conquer; he knew therefore how to ſpare. The charge of cruelty belonged to him alone whom defeat enraged, and diſappointment maddened; who when he raiſed the ſiege wreaked his vengeance on the hapleſs natives, "ravaging their country, and burning their harveſts:" who when burthened with the ſick of his army could deviſe the ſame means of relief as butchers practice among the halt of their flocks when driving them to ſlaughter. We like not this ſingular ſenſibility of the hiſtorian, that ſo entirely obſcures his perception as to make him confound the innocent with the guilty. We would alſo aſk the writer of this article what is meant by the following ſentence: "After multiplied and irreparable loſſes, it was found *almoſt* impoſſible to reduce a place, defended with ſo much intrepidity, and poſſeſſing a *variety of advantages* which it is beſides our purpoſe minutely to detail." Is not this ſomewhat ſlighting the perſevering genius of the deſerter of his army, to ſuppoſe that there remained a bare poſſibility of effecting his enterprize at the time he relinquiſhed it?—And what were thoſe various *advantages* which Acre poſſeſſed againſt its beſiegers, that "it was *beſides*" the purpoſe of the Encyclopediſt "minutely to detail?" We are told that the fortifications of the town were in ſo bad a ſtate as to give the Pacha Djezzar "reaſon to diſtruſt his ſecurity at Acre," and he was therefore "preparing to make

make good his retreat," when Sir Sydney Smith repaired the fortreſs, and repeatedly repulſed the renewed and varied attacks of the French under Buonaparte. From Sir Sydney's own account the garriſon of Acre had no advantages over the enemy but what their determined courage inſured them. The beſiegers greatly outnumbered the beſieged. Their attacks were inceſſant; the breaches in the wall were numerous; the garriſon continually harraſſed for 60 days, by a well conditioned, amply ſupplied, and frequently reinforced army of aſſailants. What then, was this variety of advantages poſſeſſed by Sir Sydney and the Turkiſh commander? Surely it was not *beſides* the purpoſe of a work to account for its aſſertions, eſpecially when thoſe aſſertions implicate the fame of a Britiſh hero, and derogate from the glory of an achievement unequalled either in ancient or in modern annals of warlike deeds. We remember well the inoculation of Egyptian politics, and we perceive the marks of it are not yet entirely effaced. We would, however, recommend to the Encyclopediſt, when he becomes the hiſtorian of his country's renown, to be more tender of its glorious truths, and when he takes upon him to ſpeak of her great exploits, to be more afraid of tarniſhing their greatneſs by inſinuation without proof, than of entering "minutely into detail" of their particulars.

We have dwelt upon this article, becauſe we conſider it as one of the moſt important events of the late war, evincing in the ſtrongeſt manner the ſuperiority of the proweſs of Britiſh force, and uniting with the famous battle of Alexandria to eſtabliſh the preeminence of Britiſh courage, and the celebrity of the Britiſh name over all the attempts of our enemies, and throughout the remoteſt regions of the habitable globe. The defence of Acre in conjunction with the battle of Alexandria, furniſhes a ſubject for the pen of the Engliſh hiſtorian, ſuch as he may dwell upon with national exultation, and not treſpaſs upon hiſtorical impartiality; to depreciate therefore, or to obſcure the glory of ſuch actions, is to blot the faireſt page of our hiſtory.

The following reaſoning on the uſe of "Action" in oratory is ſo irrational, ſo inconcluſive, and ſo contradictory, that we cannot paſs it over without ſtricture. We preſume, from ſeeing no author referred to, that it is a deduction of the perſon who contributed the article; be it whoſe it may, it is the lameſt piece of ratiocination we ever met with.

"After all," ſays the writer, "it is a point that will bear being controverted, whether action ought to be practiſed and encouraged *at all.* A thing that has ſo much command over mankind, it is certain muſt be very dangerous, *since it is capable of being turned to our diſadvantage as well as to our advantage.* It is putting a weapon in the hands of another, *which if he pleases* he may make uſe of to ſubdue and enſlave us; and, *accordingly,* hiſtory is *full* of the pernicious *uſes* made of it.—*For this reaſon,* eloquence and action have been *unduly* diſcouraged by modern policy; and both the *bar* and *the pulpit* have been brought to a more *frigid* way of delivery.

"But

" But this is an extreme, which *no* objection founded on the abuſe of eloquence accompanied with action, and *no* apprehenſion of its pernicious effects, can juſtify. The benefits accruing from it *amply counterbalance* the miſchief which it is capable of producing.

" *Perhaps* the foundation of *all* action may be *vicious* and *immoral*. Voice and geſture, we know, will affect brutes, not as they have *reaſon*, but as they have *paſſions*. *So far* as theſe are uſed in a diſcourſe, therefore, it does not regard an aſſembly of men more than it would a herd of quadrupeds; that is, their whole effort is ſpent, not on the rational faculties *which are out of the queſtion*," but on the animal ones, which alone they endeavour to poſſeſs and actuate, independently of reaſon; nay more, our reaſon and the judgment itſelf are intended to be biaſſed and inclined by them, action being *only* uſed as an indirect way of coming at the reaſon where a direct and immediate one was wanting; *i. e.* where the judgment cannot be taken by the proper means, argument, it is to be taken indirectly by circuition and ſtratagem."

We will follow the track of this reaſoning, and ſee how it bears itſelf out in its premiſes and concluſions. " After all," that is, we preſume, after all that can be ſaid for or againſt the uſe of action, " it is a point that will bear being *controverted*, whether action ought to be practiſed and encouraged at all?" This point certainly may be controverted, as all premiſes may in ſome degree or other be diſputed; but all diſputations do not ſet aſide or confirm concluſions, and therefore the poſſibility of controverting this point is no proof of the impropriety of the uſe of action; and we confeſs in the following reaſon aſcribed, we ſee no ſubverſion of its claim to propriety. " A thing that has ſo much command over mankind it is certain muſt be very dangerous;" but not ſurely becauſe it *has* ſo much command over mankind; if ſo, then all virtuous influence, all conſcientious ſcruple, all good impreſſions muſt be very dangerous: neither is it ſo, becauſe " it is capable of being turned to our diſadvantage as well as to our advantage;" for there are ſeveral of the beſt principles of the ſoul, many of our natural endowments, many of the moſt uſeful inventions among men, and many of their moſt perfect inſtitutions which are liable to this equal degree of perverſion from, as well as their appropriation to, their primary purpoſe,—the advantage and happineſs of mankind. Thus, for inſtance, charity, ingenuouſneſs, honourable adherence to truth, liberality, candour, have all, at times, expoſed us to the artifice and the injury of the world, and have been abuſed to our diſadvantage as often as they have been turned to our advantage; but they are not for that reaſon dangerous, neither is it a point to be controverted whether they ought to be practiſed and encouraged. Speech is certainly capable of being turned to our diſadvantage as well as advantage, but is not on that account dangerous; nor on that account are we to lament that man was excluſively endowed with it. Mechanical aid, diſcoveries in medicine, the invention of money, are not to be deemed dangerous, nor to be leſs encouraged and applied to their ſeveral uſes, merely becauſe it is

poſſible

poſſible with the ſame agency to pull down as well as build up, to kill as well as to cure, and to circumvent as well as promote the good of ſociety! Education, likewiſe, is hardly to be regarded as dangerous, from its affording the villain the means of expediting the proſecution of his ſchemes, or of laying his ſnares with more ſkill and profounder cunning. In ſhort, no acquiſition, no attainment ought to be diſcouraged as dangerous, if they can be rendered uſeful, merely becauſe it is poſſible to pervert their uſe.* Action, therefore, whilſt it is as capable of prevailing over the bad as of miſleading the good, ought to be practiſed and encouraged, and more eſpecially when thus conſidered, the chance of its being turned to our advantage is much greater than that of its being applied to our diſadvantage, ſince the bad are always in every community more numerous than the good, and vice more general than virtue. We ſee not how the practice of action can be "putting a weapon in the hands of another to be made uſe of at his pleaſure to ſubdue and enſlave us," more than the adaptation of any acquirement to its peculiar purpoſe, enables another to pervert the effect. The expreſſion "if he pleaſes," is particularly vague, becauſe if we ourſelves be ſo well acquainted with the impreſſive and ſeductive influence of action, we muſt in that knowledge be too well guarded againſt the attempts of another to enſnare our minds, to allow of his bearing them captive at his will. And why after this very inconcluſive reaſoning are we told, that "hiſtory is *accordingly* full of the pernicious uſes made of it." Is it becauſe it is a point that admits of controverſy whether action ought to be practiſed at all, or is it becauſe it is very dangerous, or becauſe it is putting a weapon in the hands of another. We are totally at a loſs to apply this word *accordingly* to any part of the ſentence, or to diſcover the antecedent part of the argument whence this ſubſequent concluſion can be drawn; beſides, there is much inaccuracy in this expreſſion; for how can hiſtory be ſaid to be full of the pernicious uſes made of action? It ought to have been "full of *inſtances* of the pernicious uſe made of it." Another deduction follows, the connection of which with what goes before is not ſo immediately apparent. "*For this reaſon*, eloquence and action have been *unduly* diſcouraged by modern policy." For what reaſon? becauſe hiſtory is full of the pernicious uſes of it? We are not aware of hiſtory being thus *full* of ſuch uſes. The ſpeeches of Demoſt-

* What would the editor of this work think of us were we to aſſume the general principle of this argument againſt the compilation of an Encyclopædia. A ſpecies of literary action which he has clearly ſhewn us may be made uſe of greatly to the diſadvantage of mankind in general, as poſſeſſing all the dangerous powers of the ſubject we are upon—"*being uſed as an indirect way of coming at the reaſon, where a direct and immediate one was wanting*; i. e. *when the judgment cannot be taken by the proper means, argument, it may thus be taken indirectly by circuition and ſtratagem.*"

hence

henes and Cicero, thoſe two great maſters of eloquence, who both declared their ſentiments ſo ſtrongly in favour of action, were never delivered with any other deſign than that of exciting patriotic ardour, and aſſerting or demanding the right of diſtributive juſtice.—If the reaſon for this diſcouragement be the dangerous command which action is ſaid to have over mankind, and its liability to be converted to our diſadvantage as well as advantage, then why is it ſaid to be *unduly* diſcouraged? and ſurely modern policy muſt be fully juſtified if taking warning from the pernicious uſes made of it in ancient times, it contracts the latitude of its practice. There is not a little contradiction in this article; and we would wiſh to alter a word in the ſucceeding ſentence, "both the bar and the pulpit have been brought to a more *frigid* way of delivery;" we would ſubſtitute *ſuppreſſed manner* for "frigid way."

With reſpect to the allegation againſt the bar, we would refer the writer to two or three of the moſt popular advocates of the preſent day; and although he would not find all the impetuoſity of this *eloquence of the body*, he would diſcover ſufficient of that impreſſive energy of manner to convince him that the epithet "frigid" is ill choſen and miſapplied. And as to the pulpit we have had the ſatisfaction of knowing more than two or three of our metropolitan preachers whoſe doctrine, ſound and edifying in itſelf, has not wanted that apoſtolic fervour which aſſiſts the progreſs of conviction, or that adventitious aid of ſuitable action which impreſſes the truths thus delivered, moſt forcibly on the heart. The writer goes on to involve himſelf in a ſecond contradiction—"but this is an extreme which *no* objection founded on the abuſe of eloquence accompanied with action, and *no* apprehenſion of its pernicious effects can juſtify." The poſition therefore of "its being a point which will bear to be controverted whether action ought to be practiſed or encouraged at all," is of no account, and altogether futile. And notwithſtanding "hiſtory is full of its pernicious uſes, and it is certainly very dangerous," yet, "no objection againſt it, no apprehenſion of its pernicious effects can juſtify its diſuſe;" for it is added, "the benefits accruing from it amply counterbalance the miſchief it is capable of producing;" if ſo, where is its dangerous influence? what fear need there be entertained of putting ſuch a weapon in the hands of another?

A new hypotheſis then follows equally as devoid of pertinency, and groundleſs as the former. "*Perhaps* the foundation of *all* action *may* be vicious and immoral." If this can be proved, we muſt allow ſtill more, the foundation cannot be vicious and immoral without the principle being ſo, and both theſe cooperating, the effect muſt of neceſſity be ſo likewiſe. In this caſe action ought certainly to be diſcouraged, becauſe it muſt be very dangerous. Even the moſt ſuppreſſed action ought utterly to be rejected; and if all action may proceed from ſo corrupt a ſource—the wave of the hand, the motion of the eye, the compreſſion or elevation of the brows, the ſlight-

eſt

eſt muſcular exertion muſt be avoided, and oratory be reduced to the mere inflections of the voice for the ſtrengthening of thoſe impreſſions which words are intended to convey; but inflection of tone muſt proceed from the feelings as well as from the judgment, and the impulſe of ſenſation will communicate itſelf to the features, to the hands, and to the whole exterior of our frame, and thus be demonſtrated as much by our action as by our words. What vice or immorality then can there be in this correſpondence which nature herſelf ſanctions and enforces? The following reaſon, however, is aſcribed for this hypothetical propoſition: "Voice and geſture, we know, will affect brutes, not as they have reaſon but as they have paſſions; ſo far as *theſe* are uſed in a diſcourſe, therefore, *it* does not regard an aſſembly of men more than it would a herd of quadrupeds: that is, *their* whole effort is ſpent, not on the rational faculties, which are out of the queſtion, but on the animal ones, which alone they endeavour to poſſeſs and actuate, independently of reaſon." If amid this ſtrange confuſion of antecedents it be poſſible to trace the connection of the argument, it muſt be this;—that voice and geſture are deemed the foundation of action; that theſe apply to the paſſions, and therefore affect alike men and beaſts; which is ſuppoſing that reaſon and inſtinct are coequal; that man, who has the power of regulating his paſſions, is alike ſubject to their impoſition, and in the ſame degree incapable of reſiſting them with beaſts that have not this power; but we think, that thus putting the rational faculties "out of the queſtion," both a priori and a poſteriori, is aſſuming too much, and the level is more degrading than the truth will admit of. It is then obſerved in the next place, that "our reaſon and the judgment itſelf are intended to be biaſſed and inclined by them; action being only uſed as an indirect way of coming at the reaſon, where a direct and immediate one *was* wanting; *i. e.* where the judgment cannot be taken by the proper means, argument, it is to be taken indirectly by *circuition* and ſtratagem."—(Qu. is not the application of this word "circuition" ſomewhat forced?) But where in all this does the ſuppoſed vicious and immoral foundation appear? for if action be uſed directly or indirectly in order "to come at the reaſon," the reaſon is evidently "not out of the queſtion." But the writer relieves us at once both from his hypotheſis and the perplexity of his ratiocination by telling us, that "upon the whole, action does not tend to give the mind *any information* about the ſubject that is diſcuſſed, nor *is it deſigned* to convey any arguments or *ideas* which the *ſimple uſe of language* would not convey!" Where then is its ſubduing and enſlaving power? where its vicious and immoral foundation, we aſk again. Can it be vicious and immoral, when we learn from the author of this hypotheſis, that "it may be uſeful in awakening and fixing the attention, provided that it be accompanied with ſuitable argument and addreſs;" whence it is to be concluded, if Cicero's maxim be allowed "Utilitatis eadem quæ honeſtatis eſt regula," that action is not of ſo diſhonour-

diſhonourable a purport as this circuitous hypothetical ontologiſt, in ſo perplexed a manner, endeavours to make out. Whether this train of reaſoning, which we have thus remarked upon, be ſpun out of the editor's wool, or whether it be taken out of the woof of any profeſſed manufacturer of ſuch ſubjects, it is certainly of very flimſy texture and hardly affords covering for argument.

We have now another glaring ſpecimen of ſcepticiſm to extract from this Encyclopædia, in addition to that with which we terminated our laſt review. The ſame actuating ſpirit of doubt ſeems to diffuſe itſelf over the biographical account of "*ADAM*" as ſhewed its infidel influence in the word "Accommodation." After having recounted the ſubſtance of the ſcriptural detail of Adam and Eve's formation, diſpoſal, diſobedience, and expulſion from Paradiſe, we have the following addition of the editor's inſinuation.

"Such is the *concise* account which the ſcriptures give us of the origin of the human race: but this account *even if we allow* Moſes to have been the writer of it, was not compiled till about 2300 years after the creation, and in the opinion of *many*, it is either *wholly*, or in *part* ſo blended with *allegory*, that it is not eaſy to give a ſatisfactory explication of *every* circumſtance to which it alludes. *Whether* it be underſtood *literally* or *allegorically*, it ſuggeſts many *curious* queſtions which have furniſhed ſcope for much *learned* criticiſm, and for a variety of *fanciful* conjectures."

We will diſſect this paſſage in all its inferences, and lay open all the hidden depoſitaries of its infection. This "*conciſe* account" is the information which Moſes delivered to the world, for the inſtruction of every generation of man, and was dictated to him by GOD himſelf. Till this account appeared all was pagan darkneſs, all was unſatisfied curioſity and "fanciful conjecture." The origin of the world, of man, and of evil was loſt in the fictions of poetry and the errors of philoſophy; till it pleaſed the divine wiſdom to give to Moſes the "ſpirit of underſtanding," and to enable him to furniſh future ages with that intelligence which they had ſo long ſought after in vain. The epithet *conciſe* but little applies to the ſcriptural account, which is as full as is neceſſary for the ſatisfaction of our faith, although it may not be deemed ſo by metaphyſical ſcepticiſm. With metaphyſics it has nothing to do, becauſe it depends on fact and actual teſtimony. *Conciſe*, as *here* uſed, therefore, is meant to convey an idea of *inſufficiency*, and is deſigned as a reflection upon the ſcriptures; but they are eaſily vindicated in this matter, by referring to the firſt, ſecond, and third chapters of Geneſis. In the firſt we are told *how* all things were created, and for what purpoſes; and that the Almighty Creator, after reviewing the works of his hands, himſelf pronounced that "all was good." In the ſecond we are informed of the production of man, who was made after all other things that were created had been made for his uſe. We there learn of what he was made,—duſt; and in what image,—after the likeneſs of God; we ſee him appointed the earthly governor of all things,

and united to a helpmate formed in as miraculous a manner as himſelf and every thing that was made. In the third, we read the cauſe and the conſequence of his diſobedience,—the fall of man and the puniſhment of his offspring. What more then can curioſity aſk, or belief require. Here let us rather attend to Biſhop Horne's more humble and more laudable ſentiments. "When we recollect," ſays he in his ſermon on the 'Garden of Eden,' "that to this account we owe all the information we have upon ſo important a point, it will become us to be thankful that we have been told ſo much, rather than to murmur becauſe we have been told no more; and, inſtead of lamenting the obſcurity of the Moſaic account, to try whether by diligence and attention that obſcurity may not be in part diſpelled. For though Moſes hath only given us a compendious relation of facts (and facts of the utmoſt importance may be related in very few words) that relation is ratified and confirmed in the ſcriptures of both teſtaments, in which are found many references and alluſions to it."

"But this account," ſays the editor, "even if we allow Moſes to have been the writer of it, was not compiled till about 2300 years after the creation;"—and what of that? there is nothing in this account which is inconſiſtent with the wiſdom or the goodneſs of GOD. And why, pray, is this affected indulgence ſhewn of "allowing" Moſes to be the writer of it? becauſe they cannot contradict it. We are very well aware that it is one of the tenets belonging to the *Creed* of infidels, that Moſes was not the author of the five books that are aſcribed to him; but theſe gentlemen; before they had rejected their authority, ought to have ſhewn by whom they were forged; and this we know, that ever ſince the time of Moſes the ordinances of theſe five books have been in uſe among the Jews. Amongſt theſe infidels, therefore, we muſt rank the writer of this article, ſo long as we find him expreſſing himſelf of the ſame principles. Who are the "*many*, in the opinion of whom it is either wholly or in part ſo blended with allegory?" They are thoſe who believe not the ſcriptures, who ridicule the decrees of their GOD; who rob him of his divine attributes, and degrade their Saviour to a mere man; by ſuch is this account deemed "wholly blended with allegory;" who ſearch the ſcriptures not with a view to make themſelves wiſe unto ſalvation, but to diſcover food for the pride of human opinion or the perverſeneſs of diſſent; who receive not the account of creation as a marvellous proof of the power of GOD, but as a fable of man's impoſition; who accept not with trembling awe and gratitude the gracious offer of redemption, but declare themſelves independent of the merits of Chriſt. For what follows if the account of Adam and Eve be allegory? Why, original ſin is then allegory, and redemption a fable; and the concluſion is that the rewards and puniſhments of futurity are ſubjects of no concern. Whence we may as well be Mahometans as Chriſtians, and the worſhip of pagans is of equal efficacy with that which Chriſtianity teaches. All this is inferred from the opinion

of the "*many*" who conſider the three firſt books of Geneſis as "blended wholly or partly with allegory;" for it matters not in what degree it is ſo blended; the word "partly" is no apology for the charge; allegory is fabulous cloathing, and if any portion of it be admitted it goes a great way towards invalidating the whole; and *that* man is every whit as great an infidel who aſſerts that it is "*partly*," as he who declares it is "*wholly*," blended with allegory. The writer having ſhewn to his readers that Adam and Eve are conſidered by many to be fabulous characters, he ſeizes the opportunity of getting rid of the neceſſity of manifeſting his own unbelief, by adding, "that it is not eaſy to give a ſatisfactory explication of every circumſtance to which their hiſtory alludes." We will be bold enough to offer to aſſiſt him in this taſk, by referring his readers to Dr. Horne's firſt three ſermons on the Creation, where they will find this explication, if not eaſy in itſelf to be made out, at leaſt very ſatisfactorily accompliſhed, by that excellent divine. And as we find attached to this article a reference to the fall of man and to original ſin, we will, with the editor's permiſſion, fortify his readers againſt what is to be then laid before them reſpecting theſe deductions from "allegory," by adviſing them to conſult the lectures of the Norriſian Profeſſor, Dr. Hey, in his admirable elucidation of the ninth article of our Church.

"A conſiderable difference of opinion," the editor goes on to obſerve, "has prevailed with reſpect to the vigour of Adam's intellectual faculties, and the degree of knowledge which he poſſeſſed at the time of his formation." We will make another quotation from Biſhop Horne, which we think ſets this queſtion in the cleareſt light. "If men, ſince the fall, and labouring under all the diſadvantages occaſioned by it, have been enabled to make thoſe attainments in knowledge which they certainly have made; and we find the underſtanding of a Solomon replete with every ſpecies of wiſdom, human and divine; can we conceive ignorance to have been the characteriſtic of the firſt formed father of the world, *created with all his powers and faculties complete and perfect, and living under the immediate tuition of God.*"

The expreſſion "our image," is thus accounted for by Biſhop Jeremy Taylor, in his 19th ſermon, and in our opinion with more originality than by Mr. Shuckford: "GOD made man after his own image, i. e. *ſecundum illam imaginem et ideam quam conceſſit ipſe*, not according to the likeneſs of any of thoſe creatures which were preexiſtent to man's production, nor according to any of thoſe images or *ideas* whereby God created the heavens and the earth; but by a new form, to diſtinguiſh him from all other ſubſtances; he made him by a new *idea* of his own, by an uncreated *exemplar*. And beſides that this was a donation of intelligent faculties, ſuch as we underſtand to be perfect and eſſential, or rather the eſſence of GOD; it is alſo a deſignation of him to a glorious immortality, and a communication of the rays and reflections of his own eſſential felicities."

The following obſervation proves a very extraordinary careleſſneſs in the conſtruction of this article: "As religious principles, devout affections, and virtuous diſpoſitions are eſtabliſhed and ſtrengthened by exerciſe and diſcipline, it may be ſuppoſed that without ſome ſupernatural *defence* and *aſſiſtance which his hiſtory does not mention*, he would be liable to be ſeduced and overcome by a temptation which the maturity of habit, and the wiſdom of experience might have enabled him to withſtand." What more ſupernatural defence, what greater aſſiſtance could Adam receive than what his hiſtory *does* mention in the 2d chap. of Gen. 16 and 17 ver.—"And the Lord God *commanded* the man ſaying, of every tree of the garden thou mayeſt freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou ſhalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely die." Was not this command a ſufficient ſubſtitute for maturity of habit? Was not the aſſiſtance of this ſupernatural warning equal to any ſupport which the wiſdom of experience could afford? And on this head let us again hear the argumentative Horne:—"That God had revealed and made himſelf known to Adam, appears from the circumſtances related, namely that he took him, and put him into the garden of Eden; that he converſed with him and communicated a law to be by him obſerved; that he cauſed the creatures to come before him, and brought Eve to him. In theſe tranſactions, God probably aſſumed ſome viſible appearance; becauſe otherwiſe than by ſuch an aſſumed appearance no man, while in the body, can ſee God; and we find by what paſſed after the fatal tranſgreſſion, that the '*voice* or *ſound* of the Lord God walking in the garden,' was a voice or ſound to which Adam had been accuſtomed, though guilt for the firſt time had made him afraid of it. If there was at the beginning this familiar intercourſe between Jehovah and Adam, and he vouchſafed to converſe with him as he afterwards did with Moſes, 'as a man converſeth with his friend,' there can be no reaſonable doubt, but that he *inſtructed* him, as far as was neceſſary, in the knowledge of his Maker, of his own ſpiritual and immortal part, of the *adverſary* he had to *encounter*, of the *conſequences* to which *diſobedience* would ſubject him, and of thoſe inviſible glories a participation of which was to be the reward of his obedience."

As to the "ſcope which the ſcriptural account of Adam furniſhes for much learned criticiſm, and for a variety of fanciful conjectures," we would willingly aſk whether we are to underſtand the opinions of the many who think it allegory, as ranking among theſe "learned criticiſms," and whether the opinions of thoſe who ſupport and embrace its ſcriptural ſenſe are to be deemed "fanciful conjectures?"

Before we cloſe our preſent review we would make one brief remark. It could anſwer no religious purpoſe to aſſert, that "in the opinion of many the hiſtory of Adam is ſo blended wholly or partly with allegory, as not to admit of any ſatisfactory explication." It could anſwer no moral purpoſe to attempt to do away the foundation of one of the principal incentives to moral action. It could anſwer

no

no virtuous purpoſe whatever to mention ſuch an opinion without bringing forward reaſons to ſupport or confute it. What purpoſe then can it anſwer?—the purpoſe of the work—inſinuation of infidel principle againſt the eſtabliſhed opinions of our church, and the pious belief of its members. But it is the fixed purpoſe of *our* work to guard the latter from ſuch attempts, and whilſt our caution perceives and notes them, our candour makes us regret that we find ſo much to expoſe.

With this article we conclude our preſent review, but not before we recommend to the peruſal of the many, in whoſe opinion the editor has aſſerted the account of Adam to be confounded with allegory, the following ſtriking appeal: "If redemption reſtored what was loſt by the fall, and the ſecond Adam was a counterpart of the firſt, muſt we not conceive Adam to have once been what man is when reſtored by grace to 'the image of God in wiſdom and holineſs;' and does not he, who degrades the character of the '*Son of God*' * in Paradiſe, degrade in proportion the character of that other *Son of God*, and the redemption and reſtoration which are by him?" *Horne's Ser.* 1ſt vol.

(To be continued.)

Home's *Hiſtory of the Rebellion in the Year* 1745.

(*Continued from Vol. XII. p.* 351.)

IN our laſt number, we endeavoured to lay before our readers the peculiar characteriſtics, and general defects of Mr. Home's compoſition, and to give our reaſons for the opinion, that it poſſeſſed little claim to the title of *Hiſtory*. Should it be aſked why, even as a book of Memoirs, it is ſo meagre and unintereſting, eſpecially with the author's reputed diligence as a collector of anecdotes, and his undeniable advantages and opportunities as a contemporary, it perhaps may be explained by the following account. For the authenticity of it we pretend not to vouch: We can only ſay that we lately received it from a very reſpectable correſpondent.

Mr. Home, it ſeems, was at the trouble to take *two* ſeparate journeys to the Highlands, for the purpoſe of collecting materials for his work. Brought up in the true and orthodox *Whig* faith, and remembering that he had had the honour of ſerving as a Volunteer at the battle of Falkirk, he looked upon all Jacobite information as a tiſſue of falſehood; and, accordingly, in his firſt journey, he diſdained communication with ſuch of the Clans, as in their political tenets ſeemed wavering and doubtful, and were not diſtinguiſhed for principles congenial to his own. In his ſecond excurſion, however, he found conſiderable reaſon to alter his ſentiments. Captivated with

---

* Luke iii. 36.

the enthuſiaſm, the ſpirit, and, above all, with the *good cheer* of the Jacobites, he began to regard them as men not quite ſo contemptible, and, if not entirely deſerving of his commendation, as entitled, in ſome ſort, to his confidence and reſpect. When his narrative, therefore, of the Rebellion was drawn up, (which contained, at leaſt, a number of *good ſtories* of both parties) he reſolved, like a writer of true impartiality, to ſubmit it to the judgment and correction of both. —His friends the Whigs were profuſe in their compliments.—It would tranſmit his name, they ſaid, to the moſt diſtant ages: But they piouſly ſtruck out every Jacobite anecdote from the work. The Jacobite critics, on the other hand, were no leſs encomiaſtic. They equally aſſured him of immortal renown; and, perceiving the patriotic labours of their old opponents, they as diligently cleared the book of almoſt every intereſting article of Whig information. Thus, it appears that our hiſtorian, if he imitated the confidence, ſo he ſhared alſo the fate, of the unhappy man and his two miſtreſſes, the one with an utter antipathy to *grey*, and the other to *black* hairs; who, on committing his abundant, but mixed locks to their diſcretion, ſoon found himſelf completely deſpoiled of both.—But it is now full time to reſume our account of Mr. Home's performance.

We have already noticed, and with due cenſure, the tardineſs of Prince Charles's reſolution to march into England, a meaſure on the celerity and vigour of which his future hopes of ſucceſs ſo obviouſly depended. Some apology, no doubt, is to be found in the proſpects, which his friends were continually holding out, of powerful reinforcements from the Highlands; proſpects, however, which it was ſoon ſeen were not deſtined to be realized. For this fortunate failure in the general riſing of the Clans, which certainly was intended, his country is principally indebted to the admirable exertions of the Lord Preſident Forbes; who, partly by threats, and partly by promiſes, contrived to maintain the moſt dangerous in their duty, or at leaſt to prevent them from bringing their men into the field.

Although the rebel army conſiſted of ſcarcely 6000 men, of whom only about 500 were cavalry, yet, if the ſteadineſs and unanimity of the generals had been equal to the aſtoniſhing intrepidity and perſeverance of the men, very ſerious danger might have been occaſioned to the government of George II. After beſieging and taking Carliſle, they proceeded directly ſouthwards, by Mancheſter, Macclesfield, and Aſhborne, to Derby, at which laſt place they arrived on the 4th of December. At this juncture, they had fairly got the ſtart, or rather turned the flank, of the Duke of Cumberland, and were nearer to London; as the Duke's army was at Litchfield, Stafford, Newcaſtle under Line, &c., and the troops of the Pretender, in leſs than four days' march, might very eaſily have reached the capital.—The hopes and expectations of their Engliſh adherents were now raiſed to the higheſt pitch. They had already begun to figure to themſelves the capture of London, the ſeizure of the Bank, the ruin of credit, the important poſſeſſion of the public treaſure, together with

with many other things, all not unlikely to have enſued; when, ſtrange to tell, and to the equal amazement of their enemies and their friends, the Highlanders on a ſudden wheeled about, and with a rapid ſtep retreated towards Scotland! By Lord George Murray, who propoſed ſo unexpected a meaſure, it was alledged, that they had now advanced quite far enough into the country, in the hope of an invaſion from France, or, at all events, of an inſurrection in England, in both of which views they had been completely diſappointed. The wiſeſt thing, therefore, they could do, was to return upon their ſteps, and meet the other army from Scotland,* which was reported at leaſt to be equal to that at Derby: And ſuch was his influence with the greater number of the chiefs, that he ſoon brought them over to the ſame ſentiments.

Hiſtory will record, notwithſtanding that the preſent writer but ſlightly notices it, that the gallant Prince who headed this expedition, although with no claim to the qualities of a great commander, was yet utterly incapable of ſuch puſillanimity, and that he was overborne by the aſcendancy, and ſacrificed to the unſteadineſs, of a ſingle man. That man was Lord George Murray; who, whatever were his other merits, ſeems not to have been endued with real firmneſs of character.

Lord George Murray was the ſon of the Duke of Atholl, and younger brother to the Marquis of Tullibardine, a nobleman who alſo figured in this rebellion. When very young, in 1715, Lord George had fought under the banners of the old Pretender; and, after the battle of Sheriff-muir, which put an end to that inſurrection, he was forced to go abroad, where he eagerly entered into foreign ſervice, and acquired no inconſiderable ſhare of military reputation. In the Highland army he was the perſon by far the beſt fitted for the foremoſt ſtation; and, accordingly, he acted as Lieut. General of the forces under the orders of the Prince, who only nominally exerciſed the ſupreme command.—Lord George, as a man, had talents that were far above mediocrity; and, whatever may have been whiſpered by the tongue of ſlander, he was ſincerely attached to the Stewart cauſe. As a ſoldier, he was brave, active, and vigilant; fertile in his reſources, and ardent in his enterprizes: Yet, what he conceived with boldneſs, and planned with addreſs, he was not always able to carry ſteadily into effect; and he was without that firm perſeverance, which preſſes forward to its object, in ſpite of the caprices of accident, and the unexpectedneſs of oppoſition.—We thus ſketch,

* About this time, intelligence had been received by the Pretender, that ſuccours had landed, in Scotland, from France, and that his friends were raiſing an army in the north, in order to follow him into England. But theſe accounts were greatly exaggerated. One regiment of foot, commanded by Lord George Drummond, Fitz-James's Horſe, and the picquets of the ſix Iriſh regiments in the ſervice of France, compoſed the whole force in queſtion.

in paſſing, the prominent features in the character of the principal leader in this rebellion, becauſe we are of opinion, that *ſeveral* of its moſt important events, and the retreat from Derby in particular, may be eaſily referred to it; and becauſe the philoſophic reader, who places ſome value on the art of tracing public tranſactions to their ſource, in the real propenſities, and ſecret paſſions of men, will in vain look for its diſplay in the volume of Mr. Home.

That Lord George Murray, who began to waver in his reſolution, was the author of this retreat there is no ſort of doubt: The manner in which the Prince was forced into the meaſure has by no means been ſo clearly aſcertained. Whether it was, that a council of war was held at Derby, in which he was left *ſingle* in the opinion, of puſhing forward to the metropolis; or whether the real ſentiments of the chiefs were miſrepreſented to him by Lord George, and warped to his own purpoſes when he became irreſolute and deſponding, it ſeems difficult to aſcertain: But it is clear, by the evidence of Mr. John Hay, who was conſtantly about the perſon of the Prince, that, but *three days before* at Macclesfield, it was unanimouſly reſolved by forced marches to endeavour to get between the Duke of Cumberland and London; and that of all men Lord George Murray was the keeneſt, in urging the neceſſity of the meaſure. Without doubt it was the only one, by which the unaccountable ſupineneſs diſplayed at Edinburgh had any chance of being retrieved: And it was eaſy to be ſeen, by all perſons of diſcernment, that, from the moment the counter-march to Scotland was commenced, the rebel chiefs themſelves had decided the fate of the war. The Prince appeared inconſolable, on being conſtrained to a ſtep at once ſo fatal, and ſo very oppoſite to his temper:

"He behaved, (ſays Mr. Home) for ſome time, as if he no longer thought himſelf commander of the army. In the march forward, he had always been firſt up in the morning, had the men in motion before break of day, and uſually marched on foot with them: But in the retreat, though the reſt of the army were on their march, and the rear could not move without him, he made them wait a long time; and, when he came out, mounted his horſe, rode ſtraight on, and got to his quarters with the van."—Mr. Hay declares, that "When they began their march back, very few knew that they *were* marching back. Many perſons of diſtinction did not know it; amongſt others Lord Nairne. When the men, who had marched in the grey of the morning, began to know by the day-light, from the marks they had taken of the road, that they were going back, there was an univerſal lamentation among them. Charles, who had marched afoot, at the head of the men, all the way, was obliged to get on horſeback, for he could not walk, and could hardly ſtand, as was always the caſe with him when he was cruelly uſed. After they had marched back as far as Mancheſter, and had loſt the advantage gained over the Duke's army, they heard nothing of the army from Scotland, and found themſelves obliged to go further north in queſt of them (it). When they came to Leek, Charles ſaid, 'He found they intended to carry him back to Scotland.'

Whatſoever be the opinions that are entertained in regard to this bold

bold incurſion into England, one circumſtance is remarkable, and, as far as we are able to recollect, unnoticed by our author, and that is, the uncommon regularity, and unexampled moderation, which were uniformly diſplayed by the Highland troops. They, who take up arms againſt their lawful ſovereign, are not uſually the men, from whom much regard is to be expected for the rights of the peaceful citizen; and the page of hiſtory too faithfully informs us, that it is to the awful ſcenes of *rebellion* and *revolution* that we muſt look for examples of the wildeſt military licence, and the moſt cruel and ſhocking atrocities. To the immortal honour, however, be it ſpoken, of the ſpirit of clanſhip, and of the Highland character, no ſuch examples occurred on this occaſion, in a march through a country abounding in plunder, backwards and forwards, of more than 400 miles! The Highland army were utter ſtrangers to military diſcipline; but its place was ſupplied by implicit deference to the will of their chiefs, who were, many of them, men of education and urbanity. No ſymptom of outrage, no ebullition of inſolence was diſcernible in the deportment of theſe lawleſs mountaineers: They regularly paid for every thing they got: They left behind them neither ſick nor ſtragglers; and we ourſelves can atteſt, that, from the prince himſelf down to the private man, the correctneſs of their conduct was, many years after, recorded with applauſe, and *advantageouſly* compared with the exceſſes of the regulars, in the ſeveral towns through which both had paſſed. From theſe facts two things are apparent; firſt, the aſtoniſhing influence and authority of the chiefs; and, ſecondly, the humane and generous motives, by which they muſt have been actuated.* No army, except their own, could, in ſimilar circumſtances, have diſplayed the ſame virtuous moderation; and few armies of any ſort, under all the regulations and reſtraints of the ſtricteſt diſcipline.—It may be accounted a trite, but it is a juſt obſervation, that the greateſt courage and the mildeſt manners

---

* The moſt eminent among the chiefs in the Highland army was undoubtedly Cameron of Locheil, a very amiable and accompliſhed character. Mr. Home, as uſual, ſays little more of him, than that he was grandſon to Sir Ewen Cameron; as the general practice, adopted by hiſtorians, of bringing the reader ſomewhat acquainted with the characters of their heroes, ſeems not at all to be his ſyſtem. The worth and courage of Locheil, his generous ſentiments, and conciliating manners, we have heard, within our own remembrance, extolled with enthuſiaſm, in ſeveral of the places where the Highland army had been quartered. He was, indeed, as Lord Clarendon expreſſes it, "a perfect gentleman."—After the battle of Culloden, where he was wounded, Locheil had the good fortune to eſcape to France, and was made colonel of a regiment in the French ſervice; but he lived only a few years after 1746. Upon the late generous, and well-judged reſtitution of the *forfeited eſtates* by government, the property of this reſpectable family, we believe, has once more come into the poſſeſſion of his deſcendants.

are commonly united; and it is from *ſuch* a temper, in a better cauſe, when the dreams of enthuſiaſm have paſſed away, and given place to the knowledge, and the love of freedom, that we might juſtly look for the flower of our armies, and the *heroes of Egypt*.

We have dwelt, with greater minuteneſs than might perhaps ſeem needful, on both the inactive reſidence of the Pretender in Edinburgh, and his abortive progreſs through England, becauſe we conſider the line of conduct, purſued by the rebels on thoſe two occaſions, as the great hinge, on which the iſſue of the rebellion evidently turned. In Scotland, as we are informed, there are ſeveral valuable and unedited MSS. in the poſſeſſion of individuals, calculated to throw much light on theſe, as well as other events of this period, and which have either eſcaped the diligence, or been inacceſſible to the curioſity of Mr. Home. One of the moſt ſingular is reported to be the Memoirs of the late Earl of Wemyſs, well known, in the rebellion, by the title of "Lord Elcho;" who afterwards reſided long in France, and died in that country, only about the year 1788. This MS. is ſaid to contain a regular diary, or journal of the tranſactions, during the years 1745 and 1746, of the movements of Prince Charles's army, the deliberations of his council, (at both of which the noble writer aſſiſted); together with free and original characters of men, and delineations of manners. For a *good* Hiſtory of the Rebellion ſuch a work muſt be regarded as among the moſt valuable materials, and, in ſuch a view, it would prove an acceptable preſent to the public.

We ſhall paſs over, without comment, the well known tranſactions that took place, from the counter-march from Derby, to the battle of Culloden, as they ſeem to be recorded with ſufficient fidelity by our hiſtorian; viz. the action at Falkirk, in which the rebels were victorious; their retreat to the Highlands, on the approach of the Duke of Cumberland; together with the various attacks and encounters of a petty warfare, during the courſe of a winter and ſpring campaign. Of his merit in treating theſe tranſactions Mr. Home might ſay, in nearly the words of a much greater man, *Ubi ingenio erat locus, curæ teſtimonium promeruiſſe contentus.*

The battle of Falkirk, which was fought on the 17th of January, 1746, is deſcribed by our author with extraordinary minuteneſs; as he himſelf was preſent, as Lieutenant of the Edinburgh Volunteers, in the army of General Hawley, and taken priſoner in the engagement. To this account is added a narrative no leſs particular, and which we are perſuaded muſt intereſt poſterity, of the *important* eſcape of the ſaid *Lieutenant of Volunteers, and four private men of his company*, from the caſtle of Down, where they were put into confinement. Beſides a moſt luminous view of the birth, parentage, &c. of theſe five heroes, we learn, that they courageouſly deſcended, one by one, on a moon-light night, from the battlements of the aforeſaid caſtle, (which were above 70 feet high) by means of a rope, compoſed of blankets; when, ſtrange to relate! ſome of them were maimed,

maimed, and others eſcaped uninjured; ſome of them hopped off on one leg, and others walked on two, until they fairly got beyond the reach of their purſuers. One circumſtance, and one only we have been able to diſcover, that is omitted by Mr. Home, and of which, as a faithful hiſtorian, he ſhould alſo have informed his readers, namely, the various effects, which we are convinced *fear* muſt have produced upon himſelf and his companions, during ſo horrible a ſuſpenſion, like crows in the air, and at ſo tremendous a height above *terra firma!*

When the Duke of Cumberland had followed Prince Charles almoſt as far as Inverneſs, and the two armies came within 17 miles of each other, it was more than probable that an action would enſue: Yet, it was beyond all calculation of prudence to imagine, that the Prince would *voluntarily* have encountered the royal troops upon a level and open plain, conſidering his inferiority in point of numbers, and, above all, his almoſt total want both of cavalry and heavy cannon. The rebels, however, with a ſtrange infatuation, ſeemed anxiouſly to wait their approach, on Culloden or Drummoſſie Moor. During this critical ſituation of the two armies, a night attack was projected on the royal camp at Nairn; which, had it been executed, by Lord George Murray, with the ſame degree of vigour, as he had conceived it with boldneſs, and planned it with ability, it might have ſuſpended, if it did not avert, the fate of the conteſt. As the circumſtances attending this important enterprize, are leſs known than they deſerve to be, we ſhall lay them before our readers as they are ſtated by Mr. Home.

"In the evening of the 14th (of April), Lochiel joined the army with his regiment. That night, the Highlanders (who never pitched a tent) lay upon the ground among the furze and trees of Culloden wood. Charles and his principal officers were lodged in Culloden-houſe.

"Next day, the army, joined by Keppoch and his regiment, was drawn up in order of battle, on Drummoſſie Muir, about a mile and half to the ſouth-eaſt of Culloden-houſe. When mid-day came, and the King's army did not appear, it was concluded that they had not moved from their camp at Nairn, and would not move that day, which was the Duke of Cumberland's birth-day. About two o'clock, the men were ordered to their quarters; and Charles, calling together the generals and chiefs, made them a ſpeech, in which he propoſed to march with all his forces in the evening, and make a night attack upon the Duke of Cumberland's army, in their camp at Nairn.

"At firſt, nobody ſeemed to reliſh this propoſal; and the Duke of Perth and Lord John Drummond expreſſed their diſlike of (to) it. Lochiel, who was not a man of many words, ſaid, that the army would be ſtronger next day, by 1500 men at leaſt; but, when Lord George Murray roſe, and ſeconded the propoſal made by Charles, inſiſting and enlarging upon the advantage of a night attack, that rendered cannon and cavalry (in which the ſuperiority of the Duke of Cumberland's army chiefly conſiſted) of little ſervice, it was agreed to make the attempt, as the beſt thing that could be done

done in their preſent (then) circumſtances, for they were almoſt entirely deſtitute both of money and proviſions.

" When the officers went to their regiments, they found that a great number of the ſoldiers had gone to Inverneſs, and places adjacent, to procure proviſions. Officers were ſent from every regiment to bring the men back; but they refuſed to come, bidding the officers ſhoot them if they pleaſed, for they would not come back, till they had got ſome food. This happened between ſix and ſeven o'clock in the evening; and, as the army was to march at eight, the abſence of ſo many men ſeemed to put an end to the deſign of a night attack; but Charles was bent upon making the attack. He made the chiefs and colonels aſſemble what men they could, and, at eight o'clock, gave orders to Lord George Murray to march. Lord George put himſelf at the head of the army, and marched with great alacrity to execute the deſign of a night attack, which he himſelf had formed; and it was to have been executed in the following manner.

" The river Nairn paſſes within half a mile of Drummoſſie Muir, and runs from that ſtraight eaſt towards the town of Nairn, which ſtands, as Culloden does, on the north ſide of the river. Lord George Murray intended to march with the army in a body, till they were paſt the houſe of Kilraick, or Kilravock; then to divide his troops, and croſs the river with the van, (making about one third of the army) which he himſelf commanded, at a place about two miles diſtant from Nairn, and march on; having two-thirds of the army on the north ſide, and one-third on the ſouth ſide of the river, till both of them came near the Duke's camp, then to croſs the river again with his own diviſion, and attack the king's army at once from the ſouth and from the weſt. This was the plan of the night attack; which, if it had been executed as it was projected, would, in the opinion of ſome of the braveſt officers in the Duke's army, have proved not a little dangerous.

" The Highland army marched from Culloden in a column, or rather in a long line of march, with an interval in the middle, as if there were two columns, one following the other.

" Lord George Murray marched in the front of the firſt column, at the head of the Athol brigade. Lord John Drummond was in the rear of that diviſion, or column: Charles and the Duke of Perth were in the interval between the two columns, that is, in the centre of the line of march. Two officers, and between twenty and thirty men of the Mackintoſh regiment, who knew the road very well, for they lived in that part of the country, were diſtributed along the line as guides.

" Soon after the Highlanders left Culloden, it grew very dark, and, as they kept no road, that they might avoid ſome houſes on the high way to Nairn, they were obliged to march through ſome very wet and deep ground, which retarded them very much, eſpecially thoſe that were in the rear: They had not marched far, when a meſſenger came up to the front, deſiring that the van ſhould halt, for the other column was a great way behind. The van did not halt, but an order was given for the men to march ſlower: Notwithſtanding this order, the rear ſtill loſt ground, and many meſſengers were ſent, inſiſting that the van ſhould halt, and wait for them.

" While they proceeded in this manner, a great deal of time was loſt, and the night was far ſpent, before they reached Kilravock.

" The Highlanders had paſſed the houſe and wood of Kilravock, and the van of the army was about a mile from the place where Lord George Mur-

ray

ray intended to croſs the river, when Lord John Drummond, who had often come up before, and whiſpered Lord George Murray to order a halt, came up again, and ſaid aloud to Lord George, 'Why will you go on? There is a gap in the line half a mile long; the men won't come up.' Lord George Murray ordered a halt.

"Lochiel, whoſe regiment marched next to the Athol brigade, came up to the front, and joining Lord George Murray, Lord John Drummond, and General Sullivan, with ſome volunteers, who had marched all night in the front, conſulted what was beſt to be done: They knew, by their repeating watches, that it was two o'clock in the morning; and, as Nairn was more than three miles off, it was evident, from the time they had taken in marching hither, that it would be broad day-light before they could reach Nairn. Lord George Murray ſaid it was a free parliament, and deſired every body to ſpeak, and give their opinion, for they were all equally concerned.

"Moſt of them did ſpeak, but they differed in opinion. Some adviſed a retreat, as day-light was ſo near, and they could not expect to ſurprize the enemy. Others declared themſelves for marching on to Nairn. Lord George Murray, provoked that his favourite deſign of a night attack was fruſtrated, joined thoſe who adviſed a retreat, and anſwered every perſon who ſpoke for going on, of whom the moſt determined was Mr. Hepburn, who urged Lord George Murray to loſe no time, but order the men to march on to Nairn as faſt as they could. While Mr. Hepburn was ſpeaking, a drum beat.—'Don't you hear,' ſaid Lord George, 'the enemy are alarmed; we can't ſurprize them.' 'I never expected,' ſaid Mr. Hepburn, 'to find them aſleep; but it is much better to march on and attack them, than to retreat; for they will moſt certainly follow, and oblige us to fight, when we ſhall be in a much worſe condition to fight them, than we are now.'

"During this altercation between Lord George Murray and Mr. Hepburn, John Hay came up; and, hearing what they ſaid, immediately rode back to Charles, who was in the center of the line of march, and told him, that unleſs he came to the front, and ordered Lord George Murray to go on, nothing would be done. Charles, who was on horſeback, ſet out inſtantly; and, riding pretty faſt, met the Highland army marching back to Culloden. Charles was extremely incenſed, and ſaid Lord George Murray had betrayed him.

"The Highlanders marched back to Culloden in much leſs time than they had taken in marching towards Nairn; for, beſides the advantage of having day-light, which they had very ſoon, there was no occaſion to ſhun the houſes; and they took the beſt and ſhorteſt road.

"It was between five and ſix in the morning when they got back to Culloden, fatigued and famiſhed; the men had received no pay for a month; and, on the 15th, they had only one biſcuit each man. The night march, backwards and forwards, had made matters worſe, that were bad before. Many of the private men lay down to ſleep; and no ſmall number of them made the beſt of their way to Inverneſs to ſeek proviſions."

What had been predicted by the judicious Mr. Hepburn,* accordingly

* This gentleman ſeems to have been Mr. Hepburn of Keith, an ardent and

ingly came to paſs. They deliberately waited for the Duke of Cumberland, who, the ſame day, came up with them on Culloden Moor. The Highland troops, diſtracted by diſſention, nearly famiſhed with hunger, and, as we have ſeen, thinned by accident no leſs than by neceſſity, did not bring into the field 5000 men. The royal army conſiſted of about 7500, the flower of the Britiſh troops; veterans who had fought the battles of Dettingen and Fontenoy; and amply provided with every article that was neceſſary for a new and doubtful campaign. The iſſue of the combat was ſuch as might have been expected. The rebels were routed with prodigious ſlaughter; but Prince Charles, with as many of his principal officers as ſurvived, eſcaped from the field.

Here, then, wonderful to tell! Mr. Home on a ſudden cloſes his hiſtory.—What follows is nothing more than a cold and ill-conſtructed narrative (copied from "Young Aſcanius," and other popular accounts) of the ſurpriſing eſcapes, and unexampled ſufferings experienced by the Prince, during his long concealment in the Highlands, before he could procure a veſſel to convey him to France: Yet this is the writer, who largely profeſſes, in the outſet, to "deduce, from its origin to its final extinction, the Hiſtory of the Rebellion!"—We would aſk, were not the operations of the army, ſubſequent to the battle of Culloden, the chief means employed for that deſirable purpoſe? And, if they were, why is he ſilent upon the ſubject? Why, alſo, is he ſilent equally on the fate of the principal rebels who were taken, and that of thoſe who eſcaped from the battle; not to mention the ſingular ſtory of the Prince himſelf, from his arrival in Paris, to his retirement in Italy?—Did Mr. Home then conceive, when he dedicated his book to our moſt gracious Sovereign, that his ear was too delicate for the voice of truth, or that the atrocities committed after the action at Culloden could either be unknown to him, or could eſcape from his recollection? Or did he imagine that a monarch, who has ſo nobly extended his munificence to the *laſt* of an unhappy race, would refuſe his ſympathy to the writer, who dropped a generous tear over the miſfortunes of their adherents; and, doing juſtice alike to their firmneſs on the ſcaffold, and their valour in the field, truly exclaimed, with the Roman hiſtorian; *Pulcherrimâ morte, ſi ſic pro patriâ, concidiſſent!*—Certainly Mr. Home has done little juſtice to the feelings of his Sovereign.

Theſe muſt be regarded as deficiences of ſome importance in the work; and we are ſorry to ſay, that they are by no means compenſated, by a clear and ſatisfactory narrative of ſuch tranſactions, as the author profeſſes to exhibit. The battle of Culloden is one of thoſe

---

and accompliſhed character. He ſerved as a volunteer in the rebel army; and is the ſame perſon, who, as Mr. Home relates, ſtarted from the crowd, on Prince Charles's firſt arrival at the Palace of Holyrood-houſe, and walked up ſtairs before him, with a drawn ſword in his hand.

memorable

memorable events, of which, after the lapſe of more than fifty years, the efficient cauſes have never yet been fully explained. Excepting the preſent, there is no particular hiſtory of the war; and, in a period more calculated, than almoſt any other, to foſter prejudice, and embitter animoſity, it were vain to expect impartial information, among the caſual publications of the day. On theſe accounts, it may perhaps be conſidered as neither ſuperfluous nor unintereſting, if we make a few remarks, not only on this engagement itſelf, but on the cauſes that produced, and the conſequences that followed it, by way of Supplement to Mr. Home. To theſe we ſhall add a conciſe view of the *Moral Effects of Jacobitiſm*; as a ſpeculation not unprofitable, conſidering the ſpirit of the preſent times, and the principles which have conſtantly been maintained in our Journal.

We had hoped, at preſent, to have been able to finiſh this critique; but as the matter has inſenſibly grown upon our hands, we truſt we ſhall not exhauſt the patience of our readers, by venturing to protract it to another number.

(To be concluded in our next.)

Cobbett's Annual Regiſter. Vol. I. From January to June. 1802. Large 8vo. Pp. 1200. 1l. 11s. 6d. half-bound and lettered. Cobbett and Morgan, Pall Mall.

IN an advertiſement prefixed to this volume, the author explains his motives for publiſhing it.

"When I firſt undertook the Political Regiſter I was fully perſuaded, that the plan, which indeed I had long thought of, was well calculated to inſure a wide circulation, and to produce an extenſive as well as a laſting effect. It appeared to me, that ſuch a work, conducted with great diligence and common ability, would, with relation to politics, at once embrace every rational object of a news-paper, a magazine, and a review. Here my proſpect terminated; but when I came to ſee a dozen or fifteen numbers collected together in the form of a book; when I perceived the convenience and great utility of this book, and particularly when I came to compare its contents with thoſe of the Annual Regiſters, I felt myſelf urged, by every motive which can actuate a writer, to extend my plan, ſo as to make it include the purpoſe of an annual regiſter, in which ſhape, and under which title, I now publiſh the firſt volume, notifying, at the ſame time, my intention of publiſhing a ſimilar volume at the cloſe of every half year.

"I once thought of giving a *Table of Contents*, but ſuch a table, to a work of [containing] ſuch a great number and variety of articles, would be too long to be of uſe. The *Index* is, beſides, ſo very complete as to ſuperſede the neceſſity of any other means of reference.

"In the *Parliamentary Papers* only I have fallen ſhort of my intention, and that for want of room. The papers, however, which have been omitted in this volume, ſhall find a place in the next.

"The *Price* of the volume may, at firſt ſight, appear high; but it will, in

in proportion to the quantity of print, be found to be cheaper than any other book published in London. It contains as much matter as four or five common octavo volumes."

It does, indeed, contain an immenſe maſs of matter, being printed on *royal* paper, and with a ſmall letter. This work has one eſſential advantage over other annual regiſters, in its very early appearance; but how it can anſwer the purpoſe of a *review* we cannot perceive; as though it contains a correct *liſt* of all the publications in Europe, it gives no account of their contents; nor is it practicable, agreeably to the plan of the work, to enter into ſuch an account. It is, however, an highly uſeful publication, containing a great quantity of original matter; a vaſt variety of very important intelligence, on commercial and political ſubjects; and an extenſive collection of ſtate papers, and other valuable documents; beſides all the *uſual* appendages to annual regiſters.

The Univerſal Atlas, and Introduction to Modern Geography; in which are deſcribed the moſt celebrated Empires, States, and Kingdoms of the World; with a general View of Aſtronomy; the Solar Syſtem; the fixed Stars and Conſtellations; Definition of Geography; Figure and Motion of the Earth; Viciſſitudes of the Seaſons, &c.; a Deſcription of the Terreſtrial and Celeſtial Globes; with geographical Problems; Eaſtern and Weſtern Hemiſpheres, &c. Alſo the Method of adverting to the Time of Day in diſtant Nations is clearly elucidated on a new geographical Clock. The whole illuſtrated with thirty-one Maps and Plates, accurately delineated by an eminent Geographer; engraved by John Cocke. The Introduction and geographical Deſcriptions, by the Rev. Thomas Smith. 4to. Pp. 112. Harris (ſucceſſor to Newberry) St. Paul's Churchyard.

COPIOUS as this *title-page* is, it certainly is not one of thoſe

> " That keep the word of promiſe to our ear
> And break it to our hope;"

for it really makes no promiſe which the work does not amply fulfil. The geographical deſcriptions are given with accuracy, and in language ſuitable to the ſubject; without being contaminated by any of thoſe miſchievous principles and ſentiments which have, of late years, been introduced into ſimilar works. The author, however, is miſtaken reſpecting the extent of the power enjoyed by Louis the XVIth; as well as reſpecting the extent of the inſurrection againſt that monarch; and the nature of the effects likely to be produced by ſuch inſurrection. But this is the only inſtance in which we have obſerved any thing inaccurate or objectionable. The plates are well executed, and do great credit to the artiſt, eſpecially that of the geographical clock, which diſplays much ingenuity, and the work may be ſafely recommended as uſeful and inſtructive.

Extracts from a Correspondence with the Academies of Vienna and St. Petersburgh. By Prince Hoare. 4to. Pp. 48. 2s. 6d. White. 1802.

THE Royal Academicians are to be congratulated in their choice of Mr. Hoare as secretary for foreign correspondence:—his knowledge and love of the arts, his general acquaintance with the sciences have been improved by travel and a long residence on the continent, where he has been honourably received a member of the academies at Florence and Cortona. He has published the present work as an earnest of zeal in the service, and an indefatigable attention to the interests of the Academy: it contains some observations on painting, sculpture and architecture, with their relative progress in the Austrian and Russian dominions. There is likewise a summary account of the transactions of the Royal Academy from the close of the exhibition in 1801 to the last exhibition at Somerset-house.

This correspondence, we are told in a prefatory address to the president, &c. was entered into, in order "to excite a laudable and useful emulation;" though "comparison is certainly not the object of such a research; but there is a competition awakened in sensitive minds by every new contemplation of congenial talent, which cannot fail to encrease the energies of intellectual progress."

Mr. Hoare has recorded the presents made to our own Academy, and given a kind of syllabus of the lectures read there within the year. In the correspondence with Mr. Füger of Vienna, we are indulged with large extracts on the cultivation of the arts at that capital, from a pamphlet remitted to our author officially, wherein they are traced up to the reign of Rodolph II.—The account is useful and curious; it closes with "a view of the present regulations and establishment of the Imperial Royal Academy of Arts at Vienna."

A letter from Mr. De Labzin, perpetual secretary to the Academy at St. Petersburgh, affords "a state of the fine arts" in Russia; the names of the officers and artists, with some account of their works. It includes, likewise, the regulations and privileges, the statutes and rules of the academy.

The public will learn in the dedication what curiosity has long been on tiptoe to find out, that is, how the large sum of money taken every year for admission to Somerset-house Exhibition is disposed of.

"It is with singular pleasure I have to record in the present year, that you [meaning the President and Academicians] have, consistently with the original rules of your institution and with the dignified liberality which has accompanied its progress, authorized the claims of misfortune on your more prosperous labours, and converted the *casual* bounties, formerly bestowed on the families of decayed artists, into fixed annuities, either to themselves or to their widows and orphans. The public cannot but be interested in knowing that you have done this in the first year that the fund arising from the profits of the annual exhibition, has become of sufficient

amount to enable you to perform ſuch an act of benevolence. They are intereſted in knowing that the fruits of general exertion gathered under their auſpices, are juſtly conſecrated to the general purpoſes of the inſtitution, and uſefully employed in promoting them."

He afterwards proceeds to ſay,

"From the rapid progreſs which the arts have made ſince the firſt academic incorporation in this country, it will hardly be queſtioned that ſuch an eſtabliſhment has greatly contributed to their advancement. The plan of *A National Gallery of the Arts*, which you have laid before our SOVEREIGN, is worthy the views of that Academy of which he is the PATRON, and is calculated in its progreſs to render thoſe arts, which you cultivate, gradually productive, in our country, of the ſame degree of national celebrity which they have formerly conferred on others."

Theſe extracts will be ſufficient to give a general idea of the work and of the ſtyle in which the author writes; a ſtyle not quite happy becauſe it is laboured; every period betrays the careful attention and painful poliſh which a grateful reader will rather lament, than find fault with.

Sunt delicta tamen quibus ignoviſſe velimus:
Nam neque chorda ſonum reddit quam vult manus & meus
Poſcentiq; gravem perſæpe remittit acutum.

An Account of the Engliſh Colony in New South Wales. By Lieut. Col. Collins, of the Royal Marines. 2 Vols. 4to. Cadell and Davies. 1802.

THIS is a continuation of the account with which the author favoured the public in a former production; and includes an hiſtory of the ſettlement from 1778 to Auguſt 1801.

In whatever light we view it, the work is highly intereſting, whether as annals of an infant colony from which it is probable ſome future nation may riſe into weight and fame; whether we trace how far the vices of our countrymen have been directed by puniſhment to the greateſt moral and political good; and, in a thouſand other views, it affords the reflecting mind "room for meditation." A ſettlement of virtuous and penitent beings it was beyond the moſt confident hope to expect, but human nature is degraded indeed when we find theſe pages filled with very few domeſtic occurrences which are not darkened with repeated and incorrigible crimes. Mr. Collins has no doubt afforded us a faithful account, which, as Judge Advocate and Secretary to the colony, he was of all others beſt enabled to do: he has affected no elegance nor diffuſiveneſs of ſtyle; it is merely a connected journal.

There are ſome particulars of New Zealand from the MSS. of Lieut. Governor King, with an account of the voyage performed by Captain Flinders and Mr. Baſs, by which the exiſtence of a ſtrait

ſeparating

ſeparating Van Dieman's Land from the continent of New Holland is aſcertained. Theſe, together with a few obſervations in natural hiſtory, alone detach the imagination from what otherwiſe would be a mere but long catalogue of human depravities.

" The State of the Colony in June 1801.

Live Stock belonging to Individuals.

Sheep 6269——Cattle 362——Horſes 211——Goats 1259——Hogs 4766

Live Stock belonging to Government.

Sheep 488——Cattle 931——Horſes 32.

Ground in cultivation.

Acres of Wheat——	Government	467
of Maize	do.	300
Acres of Wheat——	Individuals	48574
of Maize	do.	3564."

We lament to ſee the volume cloſed in complaint, and that the man who has done his duty in an arduous ſtation ſhould not be enabled to retire from it with eaſe and dignity as well as conſcious rectitude.

" With this information I muſt here cloſe my labours; and, as the annaliſt of the Engliſh colony in New South Wales, probably take my leave for ever of that country in whoſe ſervice I ſpent the firſt nine years of its infancy, during all the difficulties and hardſhips with which in that rude ſtate it had to contend: a country which has eventually proved the deſtruction of my brighteſt proſpects; having by my ſervices there, been precluded from ſucceeding to my proper ſituation in the profeſſional line to which I was bred;—without any other reward as yet to boaſt of, than the conſciouſneſs of having ever been a faithful and zealous ſervant to my employers, and knowing that the peculiar hardſhip of my caſe has been acknowledged by every gentleman, in and out of office, to whom it has been communicated."

DIVINITY.

The Guilt of Democratic Scheming, fully proved against the Diſſenters. At the particular request of Mr. Parſons, Diſſenting Minister, of Leeds. By the Inquirer. 1s. 6d. Pp. 94. Hurſt. 1802.

THE pamphlet now before us is by the author of " A Letter, in anſwer to one ſuſpected to have been written by a Stranger, aſſiſted by the Jacobin Prieſts of the Weſt Riding," which was noticed in our Review for June laſt. This publication, which is addreſſed to Mr. Parſons, a diſſenting miniſter of Leeds, between whom and our author a paper war has for ſome time ſubſiſted, exhibits much eccentricity of character in the writer, together with much local and general knowledge of the ſubject on which he treats. Without attempting to trace the progreſs of the controverſy between theſe gentlemen, we ſhall content ourſelves with briefly obſerving, that " The Inquirer" appears to have, in every reſpect, moſt decid-

edly the advantage over his opponent. Proofs of "the guilt of democratic ſcheming," amongſt the Diſſenters, are, however, too important to our readers, and to the public at large, to require any apology on our part for introducing ſome of them to more general notice; we ſhall therefore make particularly free with the "Third Part" of this pamphlet, which principally conſiſts of anſwers to queſtions propoſed by Mr. Parſons. After alluding to Dr. Prieſtley's "train to overturn the preſent ſyſtem of things," to the "Evangelical Magazine," to "The London Correſponding Society," and to its members, Hardy, Gerrald, and Skirving, all diſſenters, he makes a long extract from the inflammatory lectures of Robinſon for the inſtruction of catechumens, and ſubjoins the following remarks:

"This book is expreſsly recommended to the ſiſter churches by the eaſtern aſſociation of Diſſenters, and is conſidered as a ſtandard book amongſt the Diſſenters, in the little tract circulated ſo ſlyly by the old diſſenting miniſter at Bradford, we, therefore, without further ceremony, think ourſelves entitled to make uſe of it in our anſwer to the queſtions of Mr. Parſons, *becauſe this book alone contains full proofs of a ſyſtem of ſedition againſt the laws of the land, that is, againſt the conſtitution itſelf.*"

Having alſo noticed the factious conduct of the Diſſenters in 1801, "under pretence of petitioning for peace," their letters to perſons high in office, their circular letters "to the people, requeſting them to riſe and fight like men," and the conſequent midnight meeting "upon Hartiſhead-moor, to the number of two thouſand," he ſays:—

"Circular letters of a moſt ſhameful kind were ſent to many of the Weſt Riding clergy: the church windows in ſome places were broken, and in one inſtance the diſſenters came into the eſtabliſhed place of worſhip, and interrupted the miniſter ſo much in his ſermon, that he was under the neceſſity of directly addreſſing them, before he could proceed in the ſolemn duties of his office; of theſe facts too the writer ſhall think himſelf at liberty to avail himſelf in his anſwer to Mr. Parſons's queſtions, to which he now immediately proceeds:

"1ſt Queſtion.—Are the Diſſenters taught to believe that all exiſting governments will ſhortly be done away?

"Anſwer.—They are.

"Firſt Proof.—Many learned divines have been of opinion that the propheeies of the Old and New Teſtament warrant the expectation of a future temporal kingdom of Chriſt upon earth, in which the Jews ſhall be reſtored to their own country, and ſhall be at the head of all the nations upon earth, in which univerſal righteouſneſs ſhall be eſtabliſhed. This interpretation of the propheeies is adopted by Dr. Prieſtley, and he thinks it highly probable that the preſent diſturbances in Europe are the beginning of the calamitous times foretold in ſcripture. Analytical Review for 1794, page 334.

"Second Proof.—Now the time is expiring that the gentile nations ſhall govern the earth, and I will take from the *gentile nations all government and power*, and the full time is come to receive my people Iſrael again to the arms of my mercy and eſtabliſh my kingdom upon the earth.—Turner's Meſſage.

"Third Proof.—Mr. Bickens explaining Luke xxi. ver. 25, ſays, 'coming in a cloud is the ſymbol of ſucceſs and victory, and what is here ſaid means, that God in his providence adminiſtered by the Meſſiah, will come in his vengeance to deſtroy all the tyrannies, and corrupt ſyſtems, which have

have ſo long oppoſed the deſigns of his goodneſs, and to overthrow all the enemies of God and his people, preparatory to a ſtate of univerſal peace and juſtice. The judgments of the vials are the diſplay of this very wrath; and the conſequence is to be the ruin of the beaſt and his party; of the great whore and the kings of the earth who have committed fornication with her, nor will they terminate till Babylon is thrown down to be no more at all.' That this our kind friend includes Proteſtants in this deſtruction is evident from page 60th, where he obſerves, 'Proteſtants may alſo devote themſelves to ſupport and defend this image, when theſe laſt plagues are poured upon the anti-chriſtian party, and who as a puniſhment for becoming parties with thoſe who are the enemies of God and men, and for allying themſelves with them to reſiſt the purpoſes of God, will alſo participate in the fatal effects of the noiſome and grievous ſore.' After this the gentleman ventures to proceed in painting, page 69th, the ſad deſtruction which his diſtempered brain had the preſumption to find hid [hidden] in the divine decree for this our happy iſland. 'I am a God, I ſit in the ſeat of God in the midſt of the ſeas. As a God I ſhall reign for ever, the waves are my ramparts, my navy is invincible, my reſources are infinite, I ſhall never ſee evil——behold, therefore, I will bring ſtrangers upon thee, the terrible of the nations; and they ſhall draw the ſword againſt the beauty of thy wiſdom, and they ſhall defile thy brightneſs.—They ſhall bring thee down to the pit, and thou ſhalt die the death of them that are ſlain in the midſt of the ſeas.' This needs no comment, ſays Mr. Bickens. In ſhort, it is evident that this gentleman has ranſacked ſcripture for prophecies *fulfilled*, or unfulfilled, that he may apply them to preſent times and his own country, to forward the grand conſpiracy. By this artifice he not only teaches the people, 'that all exiſtent governments will ſhortly be done away,' but artfully attempts to make them believe 'that our government is become a party with the enemies both of God and man, and a reſiſter of the purpoſes of God.' Such are the doctrines which this Diſſenter has in the moſt public manner taught the people, but let us now proceed to examine what that *loyal* Diſſenter, Mr. Robinſon of Cambridge, ſays upon the ſame ſubject, which ſhall conſtitute our

"Fourth Proof.—(Robinſon's Lecture, page 54 and 55.)—'Sum up the whole by obſerving—THAT popery is deſpotiſm in the higheſt degree—THAT prelacy is popery reſtrained by civil power:—THAT nonconformity is reaſon and religion—FRIENDLY to civil polity—AND hoſtile only to a *conſtitution* of tyranny—AND not to thoſe, who ſupport it.—THAT monarchy would ſtand ſafer without the incumbrance of epiſcopacy—THAN with it.—THAT the entire abolition of prelacy is to be effected without *any* civil inconvenience—AND with great advantages to the nation—AND to religion—THAT the claim of dominion over conſcience is an uſurpation of Chriſt's prerogative—THAT his goſpel is calculated for the deſtruction of it—THAT in God's due time it will effect it, according to the ſure word of prophecy—THAT till then the ſervants of Chriſt muſt prophecy in ſackcloth—AND that they who do ſo merit the higheſt eſteem here—AND will ſhine with peculiar glory hereafter.'—This is pretty *religion*.

"And ſhall we not now be conſidered as having completely unravelled this myſtery of iniquity, have we not detected this leaven of malice and wickedneſs, which has been ſo long ſecretly undermining our venerable conſtitution? Will our impudent opponent call upon us for any farther proofs? We had actually no occaſion to have gone farther than his own

unguarded ſilly coxcomical pages, for the moſt direct poſitive evidence of the truth of all we have advanced upon this important point.

" Fifth Proof.—' To the *ignorant*, exclaims his Holineſs,* (page 47, new jumblement,†) the *careless and the licentious*; to a *proud, envious, persecuting priesthood*, to thoſe who only care for the rich *pastures* of the church, and are continually oppoſing obſtacles to the zeal of the labourer who is *worthy* of his hire; to *such* and to *such only*, I apply theſe lines.

——— Fools ſhall be pulled
From wiſdom's ſeat; *those baleful unclean birds*,
Thoſe *lazy owls*, who perch'd near fortune's top,
Sit only watchful with their *heavy wings*
To cut down new fledged virtues that would riſe
To nobler heights and make the groves harmonious.'

" Such men as Horſley, Porteus, Watſon, and the Biſhop of Durham, perched near fortune's top, are not only charged as a part of a proud, envious, perſecuting prieſthood, with the worſt of vices, but becauſe they have cut down the new fledged virtues of Prieſtley and Tom Paine, they muſt be pulled from wiſdom's ſeat; and their places be ſupplied by the Joyces, the Winterbothams, the W——ds, and the Parſons of the day.

" Spectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis amici?

" To complete the whole we beg leave to introduce one of thoſe pretty little hymns, ſung by theſe bigots and intended to add, no doubt, mightily to the effect of their flattering doctrines, as our Sixth Proof.

" In Gabriel's hand a mighty ſtone,
Lies, a fair type of Babylon,
Prophets rejoice and all ye ſaints
God ſhall revenge your long complaints.

" He ſaid, and ſtraightway as he ſtood,
He flung the millſtone in the flood,
Thus terrible ſhall Babel fall,
And never more be found at all.

" Haſte, happy day, that time I long to ſee,
When every ſon of Adam *ſhall be free*;
Then ſhall the happy world aloud proclaim,
The pleaſing wonders of the Saviour's name.

" Is there no hypocritical villainy in all this? The reader will judge for himſelf, but even ſuppoſing theſe men's views were right, it is the writer's opinion that the very means they take to accelerate the deſigns of Heaven, are exactly thoſe by which they are in reality retarded. A peaceable religious demeanour in Chriſtians will be the moſt effectual method of ſpreading real Chriſtianity, and it is by the ſpread of real Chriſtianity not turbulence and faction, that the deſigns of heaven are to be immediately promoted, as far as Chriſtians are concerned in promoting them, but we proceed to the

" 2d Queſtion.—Have the Diſſenters called meetings at which they have ſpoken inflammatory ſpeeches, and ſent factious reſolutions in a moſt Jacobinical ſtyle into diſtant parts of the country?

" Anſwer.—They have.

---

* Mr. Parſons. *Rev.*

† A publication of Mr. Parſons. *Rev.*

" Firſt

" Firſt Proof.—We have the authority of Mr. Rivers, a diſſenting miniſter, to prove 'that the Diſſenters were active members of the London Correſponding Society. Mr. Hardy a diſſenter was their ſecretary; Skirving and Gerrald, both diſſenters, their delegates; at their meetings inflammatory ſpeeches were ſpoken, and factious reſolutions were paſſed, and ſent by their diſſenting ſecretary into diſtant parts of the country.—*Exempli gratia.*

" *Reſolved*, That this ſociety do invite the people to meet in their reſpective neighbourhoods, to elect one or more perſons as delegates to meet in a convention, to be held on day of next, at ſuch a place as ſhall be appointed by the ſecret committees of this ſociety; and that the delegates ſo elected do forthwith tranſmit to the ſecretary of this ſociety, No. 9, Piccadilly, LONDON, the vouchers of their ſeveral elections, in order that the place of meeting may be duly notified to them.

" 2d Report of Secret Committee in the Houſe of Commons, page 25.

" Second Proof.—Mr. Robinſon's inflammatory ſpeeches, of which we have already given a glorious ſpecimen, made for the uſe of the ſpouting lads, to be delivered at meetings called for the purpoſe, are ſanctioned by the following factious reſolutions.

" EASTERN ASSOCIATION. *Harlow, Eſſex, June* 18, 1778.

" This Syllabus, entitled A Plan of Lectures on the Principles of Nonconformity, drawn up by our brother Robinſon, has *been read* and approved by us at this aſſociation, and we hereby recommend it to the ſiſter churches. Signed by order of all, by

" Morgan Jones, Moderator.

" What have our Attorney Generals to ſay in their own defence? and may we not now aſk the world at large if their moderation looks like perſecution? Where was Mr. Parſons's candour when theſe lectures were thus in circulation? Alas! it is not impoſſible but his Holineſs may be in the conſtant habit of uſing the book itſelf as his own lecture book; and perhaps has had the blaſphemous character amongſt the people, of being *inſpired*, for his acuteneſs, in enlarging with great ſublimity upon the aſtoniſhing lies, and groſs miſrepreſentations this abandoned book contains.

" But, if I live, this book ſhall have a laſh,
" We'll give the devil back his calf's head haſh.

" 3d Queſtion —Who are the diſſenters that have addreſſed circular letters to the people requeſting them to riſe and fight like men?

" Anſwer.—Mr. Joſeph Gerrald a diſſenter wrote a book in which he informs the people, that parties are only a ſucceſſion of birds of prey, of which the people are the banquet; and then ſays, 'the means of your ſecurity are in your own hands; and it remains for you alone to exert them. If your life were menaced by aſſault would it not be ridiculous to apply to your neighbour to diſcharge your muſquet for you?'

" Analytical Review for 1794, page 78.

" The ſame ſpirit appears in a letter from the ſecretary (a diſſenter) of the Correſponding Society in the month of January 1794. 'Now is the time for us to do ſomething worthy of men; the brave defenders of liberty, ſouth of the Engliſh channel, are performing wonders, driving the enemies before them like chaff before the whirlwind.'

" 2d Report, Secret Committee, page 21.

" A hand-bill was produced likewiſe at one of their meetings to the ſame effect: " The Ins tell us we are in danger of invaſion from the

French. The Outs tell us we are in danger from the Heſſians and Hanoverians. In either caſe we ſhould arm ourſelves; get arms and learn how to uſe them.' Nay, it is an undoubted fact, that large parties of them were actually in training for the purpoſes ſuggeſted, nor can there be the ſmalleſt doubt, but the circular letters of a later date were connected with the petitions for peace, and came from the ſame deſcription of people, the Diſſenters.

" 4th Queſtion.—Have the Diſſenters bound themſelves by the oath reported to be uſed by united Engliſhmen? to dethrone the king and revolutionize the country?

" Anſwer.—The information we have upon this ſubject came from a diſſenting teacher, who ſaid he had been amongſt a deſcription of religious people, who were taking this oath in Lancaſhire; and it has ſince appeared that it was a diſſenting itinerant who adminiſtered the oath in that country: ſee a late account in the papers of a trial at Lancaſter.—See likewiſe upon this ſubject, the Churchman's Magazine for May 1801, p. 158.

" 5th Queſtion.—Have ſix committees brought into parliament a report upon the conſpiracies of Diſſenters. In what part of ſuch are they denounced as conſpirators.

" Anſwer.—Skirving, Gerrald, and Hardy, all diſſenters, are denounced as the moſt active of the conſpirators, (vide reports *paſſim*) but eſpecially the laſt as it reſpects diſſenters.

" 6th Queſtion.—Where have diſſenters held nocturnal meetings to plot againſt government?

" Anſwer.—In London and Edinburgh, as appears from the reports of the ſecret committees, and in all the diſſenting meeting-houſes and veſtries, &c. where Robinſon's lectures have been introduced, at ſome of which, in all probability, Mr. Parſons himſelf has frequently preſided.

" 7th Queſtion.—What diſſenters have been detected in ſcattering ſeeds of ſedition by itinerant preaching?

" Anſwer.—Firſt, Mr. Parſons, and the two gentlemen connected with him in the charge and ſermon, &c. &c. which we have already noticed.—Secondly, a gentleman of great proweſs from Cambridge, with whom we may aſſociate a celebrated EDITOR of a newſpaper. Thirdly, all the ſpouting lads who have been in the habit of uſing Robinſon's lectures.—Fourthly, all the gentlemen involved in the ſecret inſtructions of the Britiſh Union, one of which is, 'That a conference be held by choſen perſons of the Methodiſt, Unitarian, and Millenarian perſuaſions, to concert meaſures, to draw in the Methodiſts.' In purſuance of this plan, a Sunday meeting has taken place at Bethnal Green, at which attended *a deputation of the British Executive*, a preacher of a Methodiſt conventicle, an exhorting elder of the Millenarian Society, and an Unitarian teacher, *together with a deputy from the British executive*. This laſt citizen, with another perſon, went in the evening to hear the Millenarian preacher prove the conqueſt of Turkey *(from the Revelations)* and the entrance of the Jews into their own land, when all the kings of the earth ſhall be deſtroyed, and there ſhall exiſt no church but that of Jeſus Chriſt." *

Farther on, the Inquirer ſays, " he has had the good luck too, to pro-

---

" * Churchman's Magazine for May, 1801, p. 158."

cure

cure one of the letters ſent to our clergy, which he conſiders as a ſpecimen worth preſerving; it begins

" *Worthy Father in God.* Could any act done by you or any of the clerical locuſts, ſurprize the undeſigning, it muſt be the mean ſubterfuge thy ſteril ſkull is driven to uſe, to blind man to his own intereſt. Do you imagine the days of ſuperſtition will for ever ſanction the villainous impoſitions of prieſts? they might as long as penal laws could deter man from a candid and impartial inveſtigation of the impious falſhoods palmed upon him, but thoſe days are faſt paſſing into oblivion; and the eighteenth century is the age which eſpouſes that cauſe which the philoſophic mind in all ages has endeavoured to eſtabliſh, a love for liberty, civil and religious. You are too late with your ſublime and convincing pamphlet. Man now ſcorns to judge by the ſtandard of an intereſted prieſt's deſires, and looks with juſt indignation on the paltry artifices thou and thy abettors art uſing to inflame the minds of thy pariſhioners againſt the French. What ſympathizing feeling moved thy heart in ſuch an humane undertaking, bleſſed paſſion, and enmity worthy a paſtor's cultivation.--Are not we all of one ſpecies? does not nature crown the peaſant's toil in France as well as here? does the huſbandman's labour prove abortive in France, becauſe warned by former blights, they have extracted balm from the tree of liberty, which ſecures their produce from a ſpecies of caterpillar, who annually deſtroyed with impunity the greateſt part of what nature beſtowed on their labour? Are we enemies to each other, in any thing but the ambitious views of the great? Could we poſſibly be worſe were the French to aboliſh tythes in England? Would not nature go on in her operations were there no locuſts ſanctioned in England to demand one ſixth of her produce for the laborious taſk of vending quackery once a week? bluſh hypocrites at ſuch knavery, and wonder man has been impoſed on ſo long. What ignorance inſpired thy brain to call on man to reſt content in the ſtate God had placed them, thereby fathering all the horrors of war upon God; has not the mad war we are engaged in altered the ſtate thouſands were in before? Has God then placed them in their ruinous ſituation, or the king's miniſters? has not the meaſures of that miniſter of ſtate, Pitt thrown thouſands of induſtrious artiſans out of employ, and reduced them to poverty? are they to conſider themſelves in the ſtate God placed them? ſo man muſt ſuffer himſelf to be degraded by the baſe ſchemes of church and ſtate governors, reduced to poverty, to chain in bigotry and ſervility the moſt enlightened nation in the world; ſee their induſtrious labours defeated; feel the weakneſs of old age in their prime; view their children half famiſhed; their education neglected, and ſee old age ſpent [*Aent* we preſume] up in workhouſes neglected and forgotten. After contributing to the ſupport of luxury, and extravagance, and ſtill thou haſt the impudence to call on man thus degraded to reſt contented, and inſinuates they are now in the ſtate God placed them. After ſtraining thy brain to prove, what all knew before reſpecting equality, thou art but a weaker logician than the biſhop of Landaff, and the amount of thy erudition is daily devoted to the ſervice of the Pope, or more meritoriouſly to cleanſing nature after relieving herſelf from excrementitious redundancies. Had ſuch a piece flowed from the pen of ſome ſuperannuated old woman, an apology for its weakneſs would not have been looked for; but, as it is, common ſenſe may bluſh to own it. Has your reverence always been content in your ſtation? or have you *itched* for a vicarage before you got one? has

[hadſt]

[hadſt] thou ſhewn why the Duke of Montroſe ſhould rob the public of 1,216*l.* annually for being maſter of the king's horſe, or why the Earl of Sandwich ſhould ſteal from the public 2,000*l.* annually, becauſe maſter of the king's hounds, thou couldſt not appear more odious than thou doſt, by calling on man to reſt content under the preſent aggravating circumſtances. Had thy doctrines always prevailed, the ſinews of induſtry would not crack beneath the oppreſſion of tythes and taxes to ſupport exalted and ſacred impoſtures; but man is now rouzed to a ſenſe of oppreſſion, and glories that the time is near when tyrants will tremble and obey, and church leeches bite the ground in deſpair; or drag out a life of infamy the deteſted monſters of falſhood and tyranny.—Reaſon will triumph; liberty's fruits ſhall be plucked in England, and then thy pampered carcaſe ſhall have no more reverence than another man."*

We ſhall conclude our extracts with the following *amuſing* paragraph:

"Three ladies, whoſe real unaffected piety the writer has not the ſmalleſt reaſon to doubt, attended a celebrated itinerant's preaching with the laudable deſire of improvement. The meeting from the beginning appeared tumultuous in ſome reſpects, but nothing was noticed improper in what the preacher had ſaid, till a perſon, at leaſt apparently, fainted away, and a ſet of enthuſiaſts, who it ſeems are accuſtomed to theſe pranks, preſſed upon the poor fellow to ſhew their adroitneſs in praying the devil out of him; and would not let him riſe till they had ſucceeded in their charitable deſign. One of the ladies who really thought the poor man in a fit, and concluded he would die, endeavouring to drag his devout attendants away, exclaiming at the ſame time, 'O do let the poor man have a little freſh air or he will certainly die.' The knowing ones were ſtanding over her, and with a ſanctified leer, whiſpering 'poor carnal creature, ſhe does not underſtand it.'—During this ſcene a briſk little taylor, of this new order of ſaints, had ſqueezed up to the youngeſt of the three ladies, and after tickling her upon the ribs, accoſted her with, 'how do you *feel*, Miſs? is your heart ſoftened? will you be *downed*?' The young lady modeſtly declined the honour, but a boy who was ſtanding beſide her, popped his head down and began a groaning, and the praying ſcene immediately recommenced; after which the boy ran away laughing, as hard as he could, at the folly of this ſtrange ſort of believers. There is, Sir, here

---

"* It is neceſſary to note that the reſpectable clergyman to whom this letter was ſent, was actually attacked, one evening as he returned from doing his duty, by a banditti, commiſſioned no doubt by the conſpirators for the purpoſe; and had it not been for his native preſence of mind, and the interpoſition of a kind providence, he moſt probably would have fallen a victim to Jacobin malignity. Can there be a doubt that the men who deny the exiſtence of the nocturnal meetings are concerned in theſe matters? It was high time for the Inquirer to put an end to theſe diſſenting heroics; if he had not interfered, we ſhould, in all probability, have had ſome of his Holineſs's flock footing the rigadoon of ſublimity upon NOTHING, and paying the piper in at the bargain: Father Murphy carried balls in his pocket, and made the wild Iriſh believe that he catched them in birdlime on the top of his noſe, as they were coming from the enemy at his brains, and this birdlime he probably called a SPIRITUAL GIFT.—Quere, What do theſe prieſts deſerve?"

not

not one ſingle word of exaggeration; and, after this, I confeſs I am not afraid to aſk again if ſuch rank fanaticiſm and folly ought for one moment to be encouraged in any civilized country?"

In point of ſtyle, grammatical accuracy, and correctneſs of punctuation, our readers will perceive, from the above excerpts, that the pamphlet which we have juſt cloſed is eminently defective: we ſhould preſume that the author has not had an opportunity of peruſing the proof ſheets. The matter, however, is important; the writer is in earneſt, is well informed on his ſubject, and the graces of compoſition muſt yield to primary conſiderations.

A Sermon preached at the Parish Church of St. Andrew, in the City of Norwich, upon June 1; *being the day of General Thanksgiving for Peace.* By the Rev. Lancaſter Adkin, A. M. and publiſhed at the requeſt of the Pariſhioners. 4to. Pp. 16. Bacon, Norwich. 1802.

THE preacher enumerates the ſplendid victories atchieved by the Britiſh arms, during the late war, which he, with becoming piety, aſcribes to the God of Hoſts, and conſiders as a proper cauſe for thankſgiving. "The enemy hath not done us violence, the SON OF WICKEDNESS hath not hurt us;" exclaims the preacher, in the words of the Pſalmiſt, alluding to the defeat of the French in Egypt. After urging his audience to be thankful for the paſt, he exhorts them to be vigilant for the future. "There ſtill remains," he ſays, "a very ſerious, very important, part for you, who have ſo glorioufly ſtood forth, the guardians of your country; for ALL indeed to act; never was there more occaſion to be prepared againſt the wily foe, who knows no principles, when ambition prompts, or intereſt preponderates, who, with 300,000 men in arms, pretends to dictate ſtill to all the world, but CHRISTIAN BRITONS." We ſuſpect that the *exception* is not correct, and that Britons themſelves are not exempted from the impudent pretence. The author's views, however, of the paſt and of the future, appear to us to be founded on a juſt conception of the preſent ſtate of Europe.

POLITICS and POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Facts explanatory of the inſtrumental Cauſe of the preſent High Prices of Proviſions; formerly communicated in a Letter to George Cherry, Eſq. then one of the Commiſſioners for victualling the Navy; with Obſervations thereon. By Thomas Butcher, late Clerk of the Dry Stores at his Majeſty's Victualling Office, Deptford. 8vo. Pp. 48. 1s. 6d. Scott. 1801.

MR. B. ſtates himſelf to have been an old and faithful ſervant in the victualling department, and to have been diſmiſſed from his ſituation for his zeal in the detection of frauds, the expoſure of peculation, and the ſuggeſtion of reforms. He certainly ſtates ſome very ſtrong facts, (if *facts* they be) which imperiouſly call for cloſe inveſtigation. He cenſures the victualling board for departing from their old cuſtom of providing for the exigencies of their department by *public contract*, and for ſubſtituting in its ſtead the mode of *private commiſſions*; by which the *commiſſioner*'s profit

is

is in proportion to the dearneſs of the article which he is employed to purchaſe; whereas it is the intereſt of the *contractor* to buy the article at as low a rate as poſſible. Hence it is, according to Mr. B. that thoſe nefarious ſchemes are employed in the London markets, which have for their object to produce an artificial riſe in the price of proviſions; and as the London markets regulate, to a certain extent, the country markets, the riſe becomes general, and the effects of ſcarcity are felt in the midſt of plenty. We are not competent to decide on the facts by which this reaſoning is ſupported; but we can eaſily perceive that the circumſtances which he ſtates are competent to produce the conſequences which he deplores. We ſhall extract one anecdote, which is certainly deſerving of public attention.

"Having occaſion to attend at Mark-lane one day, I was accoſted by a young country Miller, who took me for a Cornfactor; he aſked me if I would purchaſe ſome flour, of which he produced an excellent ſample; I aſſured him I was no dealer in that article, but in looking round, I ſaw a reſpectable Baker whom I knew, and being told by the Miller what would content him for his flour, I ſhowed the ſample to the Baker, who ſaid it was a very fine ſample indeed; I aſked him what it was worth on that day; his anſwer was, eighty ſhillings per ſack; I directly offered it to him for ſixty-three ſhillings per ſack; his reply was, that *he did not want any*, and he refuſed to purchaſe it at the price offered, as did many others whom I alſo knew. Struck with the ſingularity of the affair, I entered into a converſation with the Miller, and among other things, he told me that upwards of ſix weeks previous to that day, he had ſent to a London Factor, twenty ſacks of flour, with expreſs orders for its immediate ſale, for whatever price he could get; yet, notwithſtanding this peremptory order, the Cornfactor never offered the flour for ſale at all! Surely this is not the method which Dr. Smith and his theoriſts would recommend, to bring the neceſſaries of life to a certain level; fatal experience has taught us the fallacy of the idea."

A Statiſtical Account of the Population and Cultivation, Produce and Conſumption of England and Wales; compiled from the Accounts laid before the Houſe of Commons, and the Reports of the Board of Agriculture; together with Obſervations thereupon, and Hints for the Prevention of a future Scarcity. By Benjamin Pitts Capper, of Kennington, Surrey. 8vo. Pp. 120. Kearſley. 1801.

THIS "Account" may be uſeful to thoſe who are not in poſſeſſion of the more authentic documents from which it has been compiled. The "Obſervations," however, have little merit either on the ſcore of depth, or on that of novelty. Mr. C. is an enemy to incloſures, which, in his eſtimation, tend to deſtroy ſmall farms, to diminiſh population, and to increaſe the quantity of paſture land. He reprobates *tithes* as unfavourable to agriculture; condemns the practice of *irrigation*; and repreſents *corn dealers* as the *peſts* of ſociety. The principal means which he recommends for the prevention of ſcarcity are, the eſtabliſhment of a board for aſcertaining the produce of the country, and the erection of general magazines. We have ſo frequently given our opinion on theſe various topics, that it is needleſs for us to add comment on the ſubject, in reviewing a pamphlet, in which the arguments are neither marked by thought nor ability.

Conſiderations

Conſiderations on the late Elections for Weſtminſter and Middleſex; together with ſome Facts relating to the Houſe of Correction in Cold Bath-fields. 8vo. Pp. 90. Hatchard. 1802.

TO all thoſe who had fondly cheriſhed the idea that the ſpirit of Jacobiniſm was extinct, and that "the example of France" had, in that reſpect, proved "a warning to England," the circumſtances attending the laſt election for Middleſex muſt, we ſhould think, have brought home a full and entire conviction of their error. For never ſurely, in this country, at leaſt, did Jacobiniſm rear its terrific head with more unbluſhing impudence, with more outrageous audacity, than during the diſgraceful period of that election; when its ſtandard was openly unfurled in the heart of the metropolis, under the auſpices and protection of a ſtupid young coxcomb puffed up with vanity, who had publicly declared, in a court of juſtice, his admiration of the *virtues* and his conviction of the *loyalty* of a ſelf-convicted traitor. So important to us did the events of the Middleſex election appear, that the writer of this article had determined to vindicate the inſulted laws and magiſtracy of the country, by publiſhing a full confutation of all the foul calumnies and atrocious falſehoods advanced againſt them by the Jacobinical candidate and his unprincipled aſſociates; but ill health having compelled him to poſtpone the execution of his intentions, he is happy to ſee the ſubject now diſcuſſed by another writer, upon nearly the ſame ground which he meant to aſſume, though not ſo fully as he could wiſh. We ſhall paſs over the obſervations, juſt as they are, on the election for Weſtminſter, becauſe the political profligacy of Mr. Fox has been ſo repeatedly, ſo ably, and ſo amply expoſed, in various publications, and is now ſo notorious as to have become almoſt proverbial. That weathercock ſtateſman is, with the ſame conſiſtency which has marked every ſtage of his political life, now happily employed in the grateful contemplation of the bleſſed effects of his "ſtupendous monument of human wiſdom;" in fervent admiration of the ſplendid virtues of ALI BUONAPARTE; and in the eager collection of materials for libelling the unhappy houſe of STUART. Theſe are purſuits worthy of his mind, and worthy of himſelf; and we feel no inclination to interrupt them for the preſent, though, were the Parliamentary Regiſter at hand, we ſhould be ſtrongly tempted to extract certain paſſages from his ſpeeches in the Houſe of Commons, in which the tyranny of the conſular government is reprobated in terms of tolerable ſtrength and juſtice. We ſhall confine our obſervations and our extracts to that part of the pamphlet before us which alludes to the Middleſex election.

"* In his firſt addreſs to the electors from the huſtings," ſays the author, Sir Francis Burdett tells them, 'I have now only to entreat that you will underſtand that it is not the queſtion merely whether you will chuſe Burdett or Mainwaring, but whether you will ſupport *that gaol, and all the cruelties and tortures, and all the murders by torture connected with it, and reſulting neceſſarily from the ſyſtem by which it is regulated.*

'I only deſire, that all who wiſh to ſupport the *Baſtile and Governor Aris, all who ſtand up for a new ſyſtem of impriſonment for removing the old*

"* Courier, July 14."

laws

laws of the country, and introducing and eſtabliſhing new and ſecret tribunals, ſhould poſt with Mainwaring, and ſuch, I am ſure, will be the whole ſupport on which he can rely.'

"On the 23d,* he again mentions Aris, as a man for whoſe humanity Mr. Mainwaring would vouch, though he verily believes no other man in England would.

"On the 24th,† at a public dinner at the Crown and Anchor, he requeſts his friends always to bear in their minds, and repreſent it to all whoſe votes they ſolicited, that this is not an ordinary ſtruggle between the independent intereſt of Middleſex, and the influence of the court and corruption, but that it is an effort on the part of Britiſh freedom, juſtice, and humanity, to oppoſe *injuſtice, cruelty, tortures, arbitrary and ſolitary confinement, baſtiles and all the horrid catalogue of crimes that are practiſed in ſuch places.*

"In ſuch terms this young gentleman

'Cries out upon abuſes, ſeems to weep
Over his country's wrongs; and by this face,
This ſeeming brow of juſtice, did he win
The hearts of all that he did angle for.'

"The harangues of the chief were ably ſeconded by his committees, his agents, and the populace; hand-bills of the moſt virulent and inflammatory nature, were conſpicuouſly poſted up to attract the public eye, and induſtriouſly diſperſed. Nor was the aid of ſcenic repreſentation withheld. ‡A large hand-bill made a compariſon between Sir Francis and his antagoniſt, ſurmounted by two prints, one repreſenting Mr. Mainwaring, and all the horrors of the Baſtille, flogging men, &c.

"A man in a ſmock frock, raiſed on the ſhoulders of the mob, continued whipping the hand-bill, as if he were exerciſing the diſcipline of the Baſtille; another, hoiſted on the ſhoulders of the mob, alſo diſplayed his hands chained together by an old ruſty chain, and affected all the agonies and faintneſs of an exhauſted priſoner.§

"It was the boaſt of the friends of Sir Francis Burdett (and by the way a moſt deciſive proof of the freedom of election) that Mr. Mainwaring was obliged to uſe the precaution of an extraordinary guard of peace officers, to protect him from inſult."

We cannot but think that his Majeſty's Attorney General would be much more worthily employed in proſecuting the author of ſuch infamous libels as theſe, than in moving for informations againſt a journaliſt for preſuming to cut jokes on the Corſican Conſul. We dare not now uſe Mr. Pitt's appellation of the French Republic. When Sir Francis Burdett aſſerted that *cruelties* and *tortures*, and *murders by torture*, where practiſed in the houſe of correction, he advanced a moſt impudent, profligate, and wilful *lie*; we ſcorn, with ſuch a man and on ſuch an occaſion, to diſguiſe our ſentiments, or to adopt the *liberal* practice of this *liberal* age. Either the

---

"* Courier, July 24. † Courier, July 26. ‡ Courier, July 14."

"§ As ſoon as Sir Francis Burdett had concluded his addreſs, the bands of muſic ſtruck up *Ca Ira*."—*Courier, July* 19.

"This, and the other quotations and anecdotes, are ſelected purpoſely from the Courier, as a paper decidedly favourable to Sir F. Burdett and his cauſe."

word

word *lie* ſhould be wholly expunged from our dictionaries and vocabularies; baniſhed by univerſal conſent from our language; or legally proſcribed by act of parliament, or it ſhould be uſed on all ſuch occaſions as this, where the deviation from truth is ſo groſs and palpable, bears with it ſuch evident marks of wilfulneſs, and involves ſuch foul and atrocious calumny on characters, as ſuperior, in all reſpects, to the individual who utters it, as loyalty is ſuperior to faction, or the beſt feelings of our nature to the worſt propenſities of the human heart. So long as the word in queſtion ſhall retain its preſent ſtation, and bear its preſent import, ſo long ſhall we, at leaſt, uſe it on ſuch occaſions as the preſent.

This "ſtupid young coxcomb" * was not aware, that in this ſweeping reprobation of his, he included his hypocritical colleague Mr. Byng; for, if torture and murder were practiſed in the houſe of correction, over which every magiſtrate of the county has a concurrent juriſdiction, ſuperintendance, and controul, all thoſe magiſtrates muſt have been guilty of encouraging, by their acquieſcence and ſilence, theſe horrid crimes; and Mr. Byng being himſelf a magiſtrate for Middleſex muſt, of courſe, take his ſhare of the guilt. And if this ſtatement were correct, that ſhare would be tolerably large, for Mr. Byng is not only a magiſtrate, but a member of the Committee of Magiſtrates ſpecially charged with the ſuperintendance of the houſe of correction; and has been regularly ſummoned to attend all their meetings. He received, too, ample notice in the Houſe of Commons, from his preſent *worthy* colleagues, that ſuch practices were prevalent in the priſon, and therefore could not plead ignorance of the ſubject. But we ſhall leave this par nobile fratrum to ſettle the diſpute between them, and, if any difference of opinion ſhould ariſe in the courſe of their amicable diſcuſſion, they may call in Citizen Ferguſon, the conſcientious adviſer of the *mill owners*, as a proper umpire.

The writer of this pamphlet, after giving a brief ſketch of the events of the Middleſex election, enters into an explanation and defence of the houſe of correction; an eſtabliſhment which, he juſtly obſerves, has been groſsly miſunderſtood and miſrepreſented, even by men who condemn Sir Francis Burdett, and reprobate his principles and his practices. He truly ſtates, that this priſon, which, as its name imports, was intended excluſively for a houſe of *correction*, "was built and fitted up on a plan ſuited to the peculiar ſyſtem of impriſonment recommended by Mr. Howard." In fact Mr. Howard and Jonas Hanway, were the perſons principally concerned in ſettling the plan of the priſon, and in arranging its rules and regulations. So that this inſtitution, now ſtigmatiſed as incompatible with

---

* We have here taken the liberty to borrow an expreſſion of Mr. Barriſter Erſkine, who thus deſcribed Sir Francis Burdett, in the court of King's Bench, and, a few days afterwards went to Brentford and voted for him!!! The ſame gentleman, juſt before the Middleſex election, declared that a member who had ſerved a county or borough for two or three ſeſſions, had a kind of preſcriptive right to his ſeat, and that nobody, therefore, would be ſo unjuſt or ſo preſumptuous as to oppoſe Mr. Mainwaring. Yet, when the hour of trial came, he gave his own ſanction to ſuch injuſtice and preſumption!—But nothing which this vain egotiſt can ſay or do, will ever excite ſurpriſe, in the mind of any man who has ſtudied his character.

the

the mild ſpirit of our laws, and as marked by cruelty, oppreſſion, torture, and aſſaſſination, was actually the work of a man who had a ſtatue erected to him for his *benevolence;* and for his benevolence as exerciſed peculiarly, if not excluſively, in the reform of priſons!!!

The management and conduct of the priſon, in conformity with theſe rules, which were confirmed by the Quarter Seſſions, are next deſcribed, and the author expreſſes his regret, that the priſon was ever appropriated to uſes for which it was not originally intended; viz. for the reception of ſtate priſoners, and of perſons charged with various crimes, previous to their trials. This circumſtance, he truly ſtates, was deeply deplored, and conſiſtently deprecated, by the whole body of magiſtrates.

"On the ſubject of the commitment of ſtate priſoners and mutineers to the houſe of correction it is of great importance to obſerve, that the Priſon Committee, ſtated to the Court of Seſſion in May 1798,* 'That the confinement of the mutineers in the houſe of Correction, was attended with very great inconvenience; that their conduct was deſperate and refractory in the extreme, and that the practice of ſending ſtate priſoners, previous to their trial, to the houſe of correction, was found to be very detrimental, and to break in upon the ſyſtem eſtabliſhed for the management of the priſon.'

"The magiſtrates who compoſed the court, the very magiſtrates whom Sir Francis Burdett ſtigmatizes as inſtruments of tyranny, and as aiming at and exerciſing unlimited power, ordered a memorial on the ſubject to be preſented to the Duke of Portland, one of his Majeſty's principal Secretaries of State, and it was accordingly prepared and unanimouſly agreed to.

"After ſtating, in ſtrong terms, the exceſſive inconvenience reſulting from the admiſſion of ſtate priſoners and the mutineers, the Report concludes with an expreſſed confidence, 'That ſome ſteps will be immediately taken to deliver the magiſtrates from the burthen of ſuch additional reſponſibility, and the perſons entruſted with the management of the priſons from a charge, to *which the ſyſtem of the houſe of correction does not* find *itſelf* equal, the *principle of which is legal puniſhment, tempered with humanity, and peaceful confinement rendered ſubſervient to the purpoſe of reformation.*'

"At what period thoſe complaints originated, which have ſince attracted ſo much of the public attention, I do not recollect; but they were mentioned in the Houſe of Commons, in 1799, and a Committee was in conſequence appointed by Parliament to enquire into the ſtate of the priſon, a ſufficient proof that the Miniſter had no wiſh to conceal it, nor to ſanction abuſes in the priſon, if they were found to exiſt. The report of the Committee concludes as follows:

'Your Committee have peculiar ſatisfaction in being able to ſtate to the Houſe the reſult of their enquiries, as a full and direct refutation of the unfounded ſtatements, and abſurd and wicked reports which have been induſtriouſly circulated with reſpect to the priſon and its internal management; and upon the whole, your Committee have come to the following reſolutions:

'Reſolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that the priſon in Cold Bath Fields is erected in a dry, airy ſituation, and is well adapted for

---

"* Commiſſioners' Report, page 78, Appendix."

the

the purpoſes of its inſtitution, as a houſe of correction, as well as for thoſe of cloſe and ſeparate confinement and ſafe cuſtody.

"Reſolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that the attention of the magiſtrates to the general management of the priſon, has been exemplary and meritorious."

The author takes notice of the caſe of Mary Rich, which has been ſo groſsly exaggerated and miſtated by Sir Francis and his accomplices; he ſhews, from her own confeſſion, that ſhe was not confined to bread and water, but actually lived better, during her confinement, than ſhe had been accuſtomed to live at home. Of all theſe facts Sir Francis Burdett was certainly apprized, but, he nevertheleſs moved, in the Houſe of Commons, to addreſs his Majeſty to order an inquiry into the ſtate and management of the priſon. No oppoſition whatever was made to his motion, and commiſſioners were accordingly appointed for this purpoſe, conſiſting of ſome of the moſt reſpectable characters in the country. To theſe commiſſioners, the Rev. Mr. Owen, who had officiated as chaplain for ſeveral months, ſolemnly declared, "that he never heard an oath from the turnkey, the governor, or any of the priſoners; that there was every appearance of civil and kind treatment; that he could give many inſtances of the humanity of the governor, ſuch as making little preſents to poor women that were diſcharged, and ſpeaking to all the priſoners always in a kind tone of voice." Mr. Evans, too, the preſent chaplain, affirmed, "that he had never heard the governor uſe an improper word to the priſoners; that one of the turnkeys, who had uſed improper expreſſions, was diſcharged; and that he never ſaw the governor or turnkeys ſtrike any of the priſoners." Indeed, we are perſuaded, that the fact is, that the governor is to blame for an exceſs of indulgence and a relaxation of diſcipline, incompatible with the object of the inſtitution. And this opinion has been confirmed by the declarations of the commiſſioners themſelves, who ſpoke decidedly in favour of Aris; who obſerve "*with regard to Mr. Aris's general character for humanity amongſt the priſoners in his cuſtody, it is unimpeached;*" that "his deviations have been uniformly on the ſide of indulgence to his priſoners;" and that "the declarations of thoſe magiſtrates who have attended our ſittings, the journals of the viſiting juſtices, and the members of the Committee of inſpection and expenditure, teſtify a general approbation of Mr. Aris's ſervice." And yet Sir Francis Burdett could coolly aſſert "*that Mr. Mainwaring was the only perſon in the kingdom who would vouch for the humanity of Aris.*"

But, "the opinions of Sir F. Burdett are not always to be implicitly received. The laboured exaggerated eulogium which he pronounced on Mr. O'Connor, who was charged with high treaſon, is well remembered; viz. that *he believed him* * to be as incapable of that, or any other crime, as any man in this country; that he knew him to entertain thoſe generous and noble affections which lead men to do good, whenever they can, to every individual, and to their country; who was endowed by nature, and cultivated by art, with all the qualifications which conſtitute the character of true greatneſs. Yet this GREAT AND GOOD MAN, who impoſed upon others as well as Sir Francis Burdett, had at that time deliberately entered

---

"* Parliamentary Debates."

into a foul conſpiracy againſt his country, and had united with France to procure the invaſion of Ireland.

" Sir F. Burdett charges Mr. Mainwaring with countenancing a ſyſtem of inhumanity *which never exiſted*, becauſe he pronounced a favourable opinion of the character of Mr. Aris. By the ſame logic I might impeach Sir F. Burdett's loyalty, from his unqualified panegyric upon O'Connor, a man who by *his own confeſſion was proved a traitor to his country*."

The author concludes his pamphlet, which contains much uſeful information, though not ſo much as it might and ought to have contained, with a tribute of juſtice to that venerable magiſtrate, and exemplary divine, Dr. Glaſſe, and ſome pertinent reflections on certain accomplices of Sir F. Burdett.

" If the magiſtrates of this kingdom, or of any particular county, are to be wantonly ſtigmatized and vilified, if they are to be exhibited to the nation as the agents of tyranny and corruption, if their characters are to be miſrepreſented by the ignorance, or traduced by the prejudice of an individual, if they are to be held up to the popular ſcorn and deteſtation, merely to ſerve the political views of a party, few men of reſpectability or character will ſubmit to undertake the office, and magiſtrates muſt be ſought from men of a different claſs."

This is unqueſtionably true, and it is preciſely the effect which the libellers of the magiſtracy wiſh to produce.

" Nor is this all; for when the people are taught to view the magiſtrates with contempt or hatred, and to conſider every gaol a Baſtille, annexing to that appellation ſome indefinable idea of ſeverity and tyranny, it is greatly to be feared that their indignation will next be turned againſt the laws of the land; and the ſtate of the country, the proſperity of which is ſo inſeparably connected with a due reſpect for its laws and inſtitutions, will then be deplorable indeed."

Such were the means adopted in France by the abettors of the revolution in that country; and the conſequences are too well known to need explanation. And if men have recourſe to ſimilar means here, it is not too much to ſuſpect them of harbouring a wiſh to produce a ſimilar effect in this.

We agree with the author, that " The election of Brentford exhibited in its genuine purity a ſyſtem of terroriſm; the indignities heaped upon Mr. Mainwaring, the inſults offered to thoſe who voted for him, the unchecked clamours and execrations of the populace, are terrifying proofs of what may be effected by miſrepreſentation, whilſt they ſtamp with indelible diſgrace the cauſe which owes ſo much of its ſucceſs to the artifices which excited them."

We are ſorry that theſe artifices have not been more fully expoſed; as their expoſure, we think, would be of ſervice to the country. We ſhall conclude our account of the pamphlet before us with an inſtance of that profligate miſrepreſentation in which this worthy champion of the rights, the liberties, and the independence of the people, ſo eminently excels.

" I ſelect one advertiſement only as a proof of the mode in which truth has been perverted to the purpoſe of miſrepreſentation.

" It is verbatim as follows:—

" BASTILLE.

" ARIS, the Governor.

" MAINWARING, the Magiſtrate."

" THE

" THE FREEHOLDERS OF THE
COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX

" Are requeſted to peruſe the following Extract from the Report of the Commiſſioners appointed by the King, at the requeſt of the Houſe of Commons, to inſpect the ſtate of the above-mentioned priſon.

' We remark an accumulation of Acts in defiance of the Laws, committed under the eye of Magiſtrates viſiting the priſon; Acts, which involve the *whole Adminiſtration* of the Priſon in Criminality.'

' BARKER, Printer, Ruſſel Street, Covent Garden.'

" The paſſage purporting to be an extract of the Report of the Commiſſioners is found in the 50th page of the Report, and has a reference to the conduct of the *cook* of the houſe of correction. With its context it ſtands as follows:

' We heard no complaint from the priſoners againſt this officer either in his capacity of cook, or in his trade as ſutler, *but we remark* in the latter employ, as combined with the former, *an accumulation of acts in defiance of the laws* quoted in the Appendix, *committed under the eye of the magiſtrates viſiting the priſon; acts which involve the whole adminiſtration of the priſon in criminality:* the ſurgeon, by his permiſſion to admit liquors, which are ſold for other than medical purpoſes, and without any order in writing, or name of the perſon for whoſe health he thinks them neceſſary; the cook, in ſelling the ſeveral liquors, and ſupplying the priſoners with articles of proviſion; and the governor, by knowingly permitting theſe acts to be done.'

" Let the public decide whether the extract, as it ought to have been printed, conveys in any degree the impreſſion made by that actually printed in the hand-bill.

" The priſoners made no complaints againſt the cook, and the deviations from the acts of parliament, which conſtituted the criminality in the adminiſtration of the priſon, are ſtill, it is to be obſerved, on the *ſide of indulgence to the priſoners.*

" But the truth would not have anſwered the purpoſes of thoſe who drew the advertiſement.

" Such have been the impoſitions practiſed on the public.

" Amongſt others who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their exertion in favour of Sir F. Burdett, I find the illuſtrious names of Lord William Ruſſel, John Gale Jones, Mr. Fox, Mr. Froſt, and Mr. Fergulſon, who acted as his counſel. The name of the laſt-mentioned gentleman is well known for his conduct at Maidſtone, at the trial of Mr. O'Connor. Mr. Froſt, in a former election for Weſtminſter, was an active agent for Lord Hood, in oppoſition to Mr. Fox, but he afterwards changed ſides, and now ranks with the man of the people. This gentleman appeared afterwards at the bar of the Convention in Paris, as an accredited delegate from one of the diſaffected ſocieties in England. He has alſo had the misfortune to be ſentenced to ſtand in the pillory, and, if I am rightly informed, only eſcaped the execution of the ſentence by pleading illneſs. John Gale Jones (mind reader) was a travelling delegate to the London Correſponding Society, and, in this character with John Binns, another agent, was arreſted at Birmingham. Two papers were found upon him, one a letter of credence from the ſociety, the other containing the inſtructions of the ſociety for the conduct of theſe delegates. The following quotation from

the Report af the Committee of Secrecy in 1799, will explain more about this gentleman.

'They (the Committee) wiſh particularly to notice that, after directions given to the delegates to perſuade the people whom they were to addreſs, that the ſole object of the ſociety was parliamentary reform, and that the bills laſt referred to need not prevent their continuing to meet. The 7th article of the inſtructions is in theſe words: The deſign of theſe articles is to remove miſapprehenſions relative to the ſafety of our aſſociation under the new laws. This part of your miſſion being effected, you are to ſtrain every power of your mind to awaken the ſleeping ſpirit of liberty; you are to call upon our fellow citizens to be ready with us to purſue our common object, if it muſt be, to the ſcaffold; or rather, (if our enemies are deſperate enough to bar up every avenue to enquiry and diſcuſſion) to the field, at the hazard of extermination; convinced that no temper leſs decided than this will ſuffice to regain liberty from a bold uſurping faction. But to the end that we may ſucceed by the irreſiſtible voice of the people, you are to excite, in every ſociety, the deſire which animates our boſoms to embrace the nation as brethren, and the reſolution to bear every repulſe from paſſion and prejudice which fails to deprive us of the ſure ground of argument.'

"In the 13th article are the following expreſſions:

'In a word, you are always to reflect, that you are wreſtling with the enemies of the human race, not for ourſelves merely, for you may not ſee the full day of liberty, but for the child hanging at the breaſt; and that the queſtion, whether the next generation ſhall be free or not, may greatly depend on the wiſdom and integrity of your conduct in the general miſſions which you and your fellow deputies now take upon yourſelf.'

"If Sir F. Burdett ſhould now be aſhamed of any of his coadjutors, it is not my fault; it would be injuſtice to them, and to his cauſe, to leave them unnoticed."

The Appendix contains the documents referred to in the pamphlet, and the whole is worthy the attentive peruſal and ſerious reflection of every honeſt freeholder of the county of Middleſex. That county has been diſgraced by the events of the late election, but we are happy to know that its diſgrace will not be followed by the horrid degradation of being repreſented by a man who is more worthy to be a delegate to a *national convention*, than a member of a Britiſh parliament.

NOVELS.

The Author and the Two Comedians; or, the Adopted Child. Pp. 228. Allen. 1802.

THE author of this novel poſſeſſes good talents and ſome knowledge; the production is certainly an haſty one, and by no means equal to the abilities of the writer. The object of the publication does honour to his humanity; as we are told in the title page that "*the profits will be appropriated to the benefit of the Charity Schools of* CASTLE BAYNARD and PENTONVILLE.

In the Preface we find that the author profeſſes himſelf "ſenſible of the inferiority of his work to a great number of modern novels; that its attractions

tions are not very considerable, &c.; that the characters are not new or [nor] striking, the incidents not numerous or [nor] extraordinary, and that on the whole it has little interest; that he does not write for those who expect superlative excellence, but will content himself with the good opinion of such readers as are easily pleased." Among that class of readers he may place us, who are charmed with his modesty, were entertained with his labours, and honour him for his object.

MISCELLANIES.

An Essay, intended to establish a new universal System of Arithmetic; Division of the Year, Circle, and Hour; System of Standard Measures, Weights, and Coins; Division of the Mariner's Compass, and Scale of the Barometer and Thermometer; and on making some necessary alterations in the form and construction of the Scale (or Gamut) of Music. In which is also contained, a concise Account of the new Measures, Weights, and Coins; Division of the Circle, Astronomical Day, and Calendar; and Era of the French Republic; with Critical Remarks thereon. By John King. Pp. 55. Seeley. 1802.

THE following extract presents the basis of the new system of arithmetic here introduced to public notice:—

"As the number *now* called *ten*, is not a multiple of either of the fractions $\frac{1}{8}$, ($= \frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{4}$), $\frac{1}{4}$, and $\frac{3}{4}$, and consequently cannot be divided by either of them without leaving a remainder; and the fractions $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$, being the most familiar and useful in every kind of calculation, commerce, and trade, wherein numbers are concerned; it readily appears, that *before a system of measures, weights, and coins,* POSSESSING EVERY NECESSARY AND POSSIBLE ADVANTAGE *can be established, it will be absolutely necessary to adopt a* NEW SYSTEM OF NUMERATION, OR ART OF NUMBERING.

"If, therefore, in numbering, we were to begin with *unity*, or *one*, and ascend to the number of *eight units* only, and call *that* number *ten*; and 8 times that number a 100; 8 times that a 1000; &c. so that 10 of such *new* system would be = 8 of the *old*; 100 of the *new* = 64 of the *old*; 100 of the *new* = 512 of the *old*; 10000 = 4096; 100000 = 32768; 1000000 = 262144; 10000000 = 2097152; &c. then we should have a very easy and convenient system of numeration; and the $\frac{1}{8}$, ($= \frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{4}$), the $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{3}{4}$ of *ten*, and its multiples, might be had in *whole* numbers.* In *this new system of numbering*, the *names of the numbers*, and *their characters or figures*, beginning with *unity*, may be *one*, 1; *two*, 2; *three*, 3; *four*, 4; *five*, 5;

"* There are many other numbers besides the number 8, such as 16, 24, 32, &c. which would admit of *these* and *other* convenient divisions; but they are all too *large* to be conveniently practicable in *addition, subtraction, multiplication*, and *division*. The number 12 is a very handy number, and will admit of all the above divisions, (except the half of the fourth,) and other useful divisions:—This would save a great quantity [number] of figures; yet nevertheless, I think, at present, *all things being taken into consideration and compared together*, the number 8 will be found to be, and undoubtedly is, the most easy and convenient of any."

six, 6; *seven*, 7; *ten*, 10; *eleven*, 11; *twelve*, 12; *thirteen*, 13; *fourteen*, 14; *fifteen*, 15; *sixteen*, 16; *seventeen*, 17; *twenty*, 20; *twenty-one*, 21; *twenty-two*, 22; and ſo on; the names and figures of *eight*, 8; *nine*, 9; *eighteen*, 18; *nineteen*, 19; &c. being entirely laid aſide."

It will be obvious, from the above, that the adoption of Mr. King's ſyſtem of arithmetic would be productive of ſomething more than a "little *temporary* inconvenience;" but he ſays he "was not prompted to publiſh this Eſſay, by a perſuaſion, that the improvements it contains would be readily and implicitly eſtabliſhed, but that they may become ſubjects of conſideration amongſt mathematicians and philoſophers; ſo that the moſt ſimple, rational, and convenient ſyſtems and diviſions, may in time be found out, and as univerſally eſtabliſhed as poſſible." To facilitate this, Mr. King requeſts that ſuch of his "ingenious readers as are *unbiassed* and *free from prejudice*, will have the goodneſs, either in the *Mathematical and Philosophical Repository*, or in the *Gentleman's* or *Monthly Magazine*, candidly to point out the defects and inconveniences, either in the theory or practice of his new propoſed ſyſtems and diviſions; and the ſuperior excellencies (if any ſuch can exiſt) of thoſe now in uſe, over theſe new ones."

Though it can never be expected that any ſuch innovations will be received, nor could they poſſibly be reduced to univerſal practice, yet, in juſtice to Mr. King, it muſt be acknowledged that his remarks evince much ingenuity, and are highly worthy of the attention of the curious in figures.

Appendix to a Publication, entitled New Inventions and Directions for Ruptured Persons, &c. &c. containing a familiar Account of the Nature of Ruptures, in both Sexes. By W. H. T. Esq. And recommended to every ruptured Person as a necessary Companion, to preserve them from the ill consequences of their Complaint. Pp. 37. 1s. 6d. Hurſt. 1802.

THIS pamphlet is chiefly compoſed of extracts from M. Arnaud's, and Mr. Pott's treatiſes on Hernia or Rupture. A ſtatement of ſome caſes ſucceſsfully treated on the new principle, with ſome obſervations on the utility and efficacy of the calico cuſhion, are added, and we think the whole worthy of the peruſal of thoſe who are afflicted with the complaint which forms the ſubject of theſe pages.

A Short View of the Natural History of the Earth; designed for the Instruction and Amusement of Young Persons. By H. E. 18mo. Pp. 108. Harris. 1802.

"OF this little compilation," ſays the author in his preface, "it may be right to ſay, that it was originally made for the inſtruction of a private family; and perhaps had its effect. Should it in the world at large prove leſs uſeful, it will doubtleſs go where hundreds have gone before it.—Should it, on the contrary, give ſo much ſatisfaction, as to render the minds that are engaged in its peruſal reſtleſs after farther information, the retroſpective view of the time and pains the writer has employed will be ſweet indeed." For our part, we think that the author deſerves this conſolation, and that he will receive it.

Remarks on modern Female Manners, as distinguished by Indifference to Character, and Indecency of Dress; extracted from "Reflections political and moral at the

the conclusion of the War. By John Bowles, Esq." 8vo. Pp. 18. 6d. Rivingtons. 1802.

THE pamphlet from which these excellent "Remarks" are selected was reviewed by us, on its first appearance; and we are now happy to see this separation of the *moral* from the *political* reflections of the author. This little tract contains many useful admonitions, and many melancholy truths. The subject discussed in it is of the highest importance to society, and, on this account, it cannot be too generally circulated, nor too deeply studied.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

A Letter to a Sound Member of the Church, with a Supplement, containing Two Letters sent to the Editors of the "Christian Observer," with an Address to the Readers of that Miscellany, on a gross Misrepresentation of a Passage in the Appendix to the Guide to the Church. By the Rev. Charles Daubeny, Author of the Guide and Appendix, &c. Fellow of Winchester College, and Minister of Christ Church, Bath. 8vo. Pp. 66. Rivingtons. 1802.

THE gross misrepresentation of Mr. Daubeny's opinion, on an important subject, which gave rise to this publication, appeared in the "Christian Observer" for the month of march last; and would certainly have been duly noticed by us had we not been early apprized of Mr. Daubeny's determination to defend his own cause; and, assuredly, no Christian champion was better qualified for *attacking* the enemies, or for *defending* the friends of our pure establishment. It was perfectly consistent with the plan of the Christian Observer, who meant to establish the Calvinistic doctrines of Mr. Overton as the true standard of Christian perfection, to make every attempt to depreciate the writings of Mr. Daubeny, and to lower them in the public estimation, because they supply every member of the church with incontrovertible arguments, to oppose and to confute these very doctrines. Fortunately, led away by that headstrong impetuosity, that uncontroulable arrogance, and that boundless confidence, which peculiarly mark the Schismatic *in* the church, they betrayed the cloven foot too soon, and, not content with proceeding by the slow process of *sapping* and *mining*, endeavoured to carry the citadel by storm. When pressed, however, by Mr. D. they shuffled, shifted their ground, and had recourse to the most paltry and most dishonest subterfuges and evasions. That our readers may be enabled to form a just estimate of their conduct, we shall lay before them the two letters which Mr. Daubeny addressed to them, and which they did not find it *expedient* to publish.

"*First Letter sent to the Editor of the 'Christian Observer.'*

"SIR,—A friend has just favoured me with a sight of your 'Christian Observer' for March, 1802, on account of my name having been introduced into it in your review of the Anti-Jacobin Review. Were I to form a general judgment of your publication from the specimen here given of your manner of quoting from authors, I might perhaps do it injustice. I therefore wave all general judgment, and confine myself to that particular subject, to which I am competent to speak with decision.

" After having obſerved that 'Unbelievers have condemned, as abſurd and hypocritical, all regard for Chriſtianity, except as a mere *external* thing; that men of the world have *practically* denied all that is *ſpiritual* in religion; and that Diſſenters, with a view to depreciate the Eſtabliſhment, have inſinuated that our religion chiefly conſiſts in *Forms*,' you proceed to ſay, with a view of conveying a ſimilar idea to the reader, that 'Mr. Daubeny has maintained that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is not *eſſential* to the being of the Church of Chriſt.' From theſe premiſes the reader is led to the concluſion, that in the opinion of Unbelievers, of Men of the World, of Diſſenters, and of Mr. Daubeny, the religion of our Church is a religion of *form* rather than of *ſpirit*. On this ground you proceed to draw a long parade of circumſtantial evidence for the purpoſe of proving a poſition, which, it is preſumed, no intelligent Miniſter of our Church ever really meant to contradict; namely, that 'God as a Spirit muſt be worſhipped in ſpirit and truth; and that *(mutatis mutandis)* the circumciſion of the heart, in the ſpirit, and not in the letter, marks the real character of the Chriſtian, as it heretofore did that of the Jew; and conſequently, that 'every other kind of religion, but *ſpiritual*, is not only defective but ruinous.'

" Such, Sir, being my decided opinion, I was a little ſurprized to ſee my authority adduced in apparent contradiction to it. But as infallibility does not belong to man, it is poſſible that my language may not always convey the preciſe idea of my mind. In all ſuch caſes I feel obliged to any one who furniſhes me with an opportunity for explanation: more particularly when the idea conveyed, or ſuppoſed to be conveyed, reſpects the eſſentials of religion. And this, I preſume, muſt be the ſentiment of every man whoſe object is truth. Thus thankful to receive candid information from any quarter, I expect that treatment to which every writer, open to conviction has a claim; namely, that equity of conſtruction ſhould always accompany the animadverſions of my reader. And to this end I muſt neceſſarily be read, *as I have written*.

" Whether ſuch has been the caſe in the publication to which my attention has been directed, I cannot take upon myſelf poſitively to affirm; becauſe for want of your having marked the page from which your quotation is taken, I feel myſelf at ſome loſs to decide upon its authenticity. Still, Sir, as the paſſage is to be met with in page 482 of the 'Appendix to the Guide,' is the only one I can find after much ſearching, that bears reſemblance to your quotation; I ſhall proceed on the preſumption that it is to that part of my writings that reference has been made.

" You ſay, Sir, 'Mr. D. has maintained that ſpirituality of divine worſhip is not *eſſential* to the being of the Church of Chriſt.'—In the foregoing *apparent* quotation from my writings, the word *eſſential* is printed in italics, as the word to which the eye of the reader is meant to be directed; and from which the reader is led to infer, that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip in Mr. D.'s opinion is not a matter of primary importance in the Chriſtian Church. At leaſt ſuch, it is conceived, is the concluſion to which a ſentence thus conſtructed would lead the generality of readers.

" We will now, Sir, with your leave, examine how far ſuch a concluſion can be drawn from the paſſage, as it ſtands in my book.—One of the principal objects in view in the 8th. Letter of the Appendix, from whence, it is preſumed, your quotation has been made, was to counteract the looſe notions that are now induſtriouſly propagated reſpecting the unity of the Church, on the ground that wherever an aſſembly of perſons is to be found

found worſhipping God *in the ſpirit*, there is *the Church*. This idea, it was remarked in an early part of this Letter, 'favoured ſtrongly of the old puritan doctrine of ſetting up the purity of the Church againſt the eſtabliſhment of it; as if they were two things not to be found together." Whereas unity of doctrine (as you read in page 469 of this ſame Letter) is certainly an *eſsential ingredient* neceſſary (if we may ſo ſay) to the compoſition of the unity of the Church; but it is not the *only* ingredient. There muſt be alſo added to it unity in worſhip, and unity in diſcipline. Without a combination of all theſe ſeveral circumſtances, the Church cannot be ſaid to be at unity in itſelf.

"Following the ſame train of reaſoning, and with the ſame object in view, I ſay, page 476, that 'a doctrine that cries up purity to the ruin of unity, ought to be rejected: becauſe the Goſpel calls for *unity* as well as *purity*; and all the ſound Members of the Eſtabliſhed Church in this country, worſhip God *in the ſpirit*.'—Still with the view of pointing out the falſe diſtinction which has been attempted to be made between the national Church of this country and the Church of Chriſt, I proceed to ſay, page 480, 'that placing the biſhop in oppoſition to the collection of believers, by which is meant the Government of the Church in oppoſition to the Doctrine of it, is unneceſſarily to put aſunder what God has joined together.'

"Proceeding with my argument on this important ſubject, with the view of pointing out the eſtabliſhed Conſtitution of the Church, as the divine proviſion for the preſervation of evangelic Truth in the world, I arrive at the important page, 482; from whence, it is preſumed, the partial extract has been taken; where I ſay, in refutation of the ſame abſurd idea of ſetting up the purity of the Church againſt the conſtitution of it; 'That the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is eſſential to the *very Being and Conſtitution* of a Church, is more than will be granted.'—In this ſhort ſentence, on the ſuppoſition that your quotation bears on this particular point; (and if it does not, I will thank you to ſet me right) I diſcover not leſs than three particulars, in which your edition of my language departs from the *original*.—In the firſt place, the word *very* prefixed to Being, and the word *Conſtitution* are omitted in your quotation; whilſt the ſignificant italics, which in the original are confined to the words *very Being* and *Conſtitution*, you have tranſferred to the word *eſsential*; by which alteration it will be perceived by any intelligent reader, that the particular meaning, deſigned to be conveyed by the ſentence before us, is totally changed.—Still, Sir, had you proceeded with the ſentence, the meaning of the author on this occaſion, could not poſſibly have been miſtaken. The reaſon why the ſpirituality of divine worſhip cannot be admitted to be eſſential to the *very Being* and *Conſtitution* of the Church is, as I proceed to ſay, plainly this, 'becauſe the Church of Chriſt has, at different times, been permitted to exiſt without it.' —It is for you to inform the public, why the latter branch of a ſentence, evidently deſigned as an explanatory comment on the former part of it, has been omitted in this caſe. It is for me to ſay in juſtice to myſelf, that had my language been reported by you as it was delivered by me to the public, it could not have ſerved your purpoſe. It could not, by any mode of conſtruction you might think fit to adopt, have authorized you, in the judgment of any intelligent and candid reader, to have drawn an opinion from me, that could in the leaſt degree correſpond with that which, you ſay, infide's, worldlings, and diſſenters, entertain of the worſhip in the Chriſtian Church.

"By

" By the word *essential*, in the general acceptation of it, is understood, either what is necessary to the constitution and existence of any thing; or what is principal and important in the highest degree. The spirituality of divine worship, I say then in the first place, is not essential to the *very being* and *constitution* of the Church. For were this the case, the Church could never exist without it. But the contrary is the fact. I instance in the Church of Rome at present, in which the spirituality of divine worship has in a great degree been superseded, by the *opus operatum* of mere form. Still the Church of Rome *exists*. I instance also in the Church of Sardis of old; which, as you say, from the very best authority, 'had a name to live and was *dead*.'—In this condition the spirituality of divine worship must be supposed to have departed from it. The Church, however, was still permitted to remain in Sardis; because in this state of corruption, she was exhorted to 'remember, how she had received and heard, and to repent.' Therefore the spirituality of divine worship, is not essential to the *very Being* and *Constitution* of the Church. But in the sentence immediately subjoined to that from which your extract is taken, my words are these: 'Had you said, that the spirituality of divine worship was essential to the *perfection* of a Church, you would have said no more than what would have been universally admitted.' The spirituality of divine worship then, though not essential to the *constitution* of a Church, is nevertheless essential to the *perfection* of it. It is that which is *principal* and *important* in the highest degree; that, without which, the end for which the Church has been established, cannot, so far as the case applies, be effectually answered. Without it the Church may exist in any place, so long as it be the will of Heaven that she should; but, under such circumstances, she exists in corruption.

" The position consequently fairly deducible from my words taken together, if I understand myself, conveys, as I conceive, a sense the very opposite to that apparently meant to be drawn by your readers from that mutilated quotation, on the ground of which you have felt yourself justified in ranking the author of 'a Guide to the Church,' with unbelievers, worldlings, and dissenters; whose object it is, in your words, 'to depreciate the Establishment.'—I say, Sir, that the spirituality of divine worship is essential to the *perfection* of the Church; so far from Christianity being an *external* thing, or a mere form, as you would give your reader from me to understand, I consider that the spirituality of it is that thing of *primary importance*, which the Being of the Church was designed to preserve; that *valuable kernel*, if I may so say, of which the Constitution of the Church is the *shell*.

" Having thus laid the subject at issue between us (I trust fairly) before you, I leave the judgment with the public.

" I shall only take leave to observe in conclusion, that whenever an author is quoted on a subject by which his reputation may be affected, the page from which the extract is made should be marked, for the purpose of giving the reader an opportunity of comparing and judging for himself. A passage, generally speaking, depends so much on its context, that a partial extract ofttimes exhibits a very false, or at least imperfect image of an author's mind. By quoting only one branch of a connected sentence, and by adopting the method you have thought fit to adopt on this occasion, of leaving out, and putting in, *ad libitum*, the Bible itself may be made to speak blasphemy. I would observe further, that every quotation by which the sentiments of an author, or an important subject, stand committed,

should

ſhould be *literally correct*. Every mutilation of ſenſe, every omiſſion or even tranſpoſition of words, or alteration of mark, by which the meaning originally intended to be conveyed may be altered, is a ſpecies of polemical diſhoneſty, which can do no credit to any cauſe; and to which, it might be hoped, Members of the Eſtabliſhed Church would never have recourſe.

"This Letter, as you perceive, has been written on the preſumption that I am not miſtaken in the paſſage alluded to on this occaſion. But ſhould it ſo happen that your attention has been directed to ſome other paſſage, which, literally taken, juſtifies the concluſion you appear to have drawn; I ſhall think myſelf obliged, if you would give me an opportunity of correcting incautious language, which has ſuggeſted an idea ſo foreign to my decided ſentiments. In the other caſe, Sir, I call on you as a Member of the Eſtabliſhed Church, to do juſtice to a Miniſter of that Church, by inſerting this Letter in your next number; leaving you to account for your miſconception of my meaning in the way you may judge moſt creditable to your publication. I am, Sir, &c. &c.

"*Bath, April* 20, 1802." "CHARLES DAUBENY."

"The information communicated in the ſucceeding number of the "Chriſtian Obſerver," that the above Letter had arrived too late for inſertion in it, and 'that the paſſage (ſuppoſed to have been a quotation from my writings) certainly ought not to have been marked with inverted commas,' and therefore was not to be underſtood as ſuch; but that the editors of the "Chriſtian Obſerver" were '*ſtill of opinion that the repreſentation given in it of my ſentiments was correct*; drew after it the following Letter.'

"*Second Letter ſent to the Editor of the "Chriſtian Obſerver."*

"Sir,—In the ſuppoſed extract from my writings in your number for the month of March, I am made to maintain, 'that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is not *eſſential* to the being of the Church of Chriſt.'—In my Letter ſent to you for inſertion in the courſe of laſt month, I ſay, in decided oppoſition to the concluſion obvious to be drawn from the above ſuppoſed extract, "that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is *eſſential* to the *perfection* of the Church; ſo far from Chriſtianity being an external thing, or a mere form, I conſider that the ſpirituality of it is that thing of *primary importance*, which the Being of the Church was deſigned to preſerve; that valuable *kernel*, if I may ſo ſay, of which the conſtitution of the Church is the *ſhell*; and conſequently (to make uſe of your own words on the ſubject) that 'every kind of religion but *ſpiritual* is not only defective but ruinous.'

"In your acknowledgments to Correſpondents in your number for the month of April, you ſay, in direct contradiction to the above decided declaration on my part, that you 'are ſtill of opinion, that the repreſentation given of my ſentiments,' in the ſuppoſed extract here alluded to, 'is correct.'

"As a Miniſter of that Eſtabliſhed Church, of which you profeſs yourſelf to be a Member, I have to expect, therefore, that you will do juſtice to me, to yourſelf, and more eſpecially to the cauſe of truth, (of which, it is preſumed we would both be conſidered honeſt advocates,) by pointing out *expreſsly*, by way of Appendix to the inſertion of my Letters in your next number, that part of my writings, which will authorize the repreſentation you have given of my ſentiments; and thereby furniſh me with an opportunity of publicly and effectually counteracting the prevalence of that moſt fatal deluſion, into which unguarded language may have been inſtrumental in leading my readers. I am, Sir, your moſt obedient Servant,

"*Bath, May* 11, 1802." "CHARLES DAUBENY."

"*Concluſion*

" Conclusion to the Readers of the " Christian Observer."

" I withheld all decided language on the conduct of the editors of the " Chriſtian Obſerver" in this caſe, till they had put in their final anwer. From that anſwer I ſhall now proceed to make my report. And that report will be ſhort, becauſe the facts ſpeak plainly for themſelves.

' We had no intention (ſay the editors under the head of Anſwers to Correſpondents in the number for the month of May) of imputing to Mr. Daubeny, that he did not conſider both ſound doctrine and ſpirituality of worſhip to be of very high importance, and even, to uſe his own words, eſſential to the *perfection* of a Church, but merely, as we have diſtinctly ſtated, that he maintained *that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is not eſſential to the being of the Church of Chriſt*.'—" If the editors had no ſuch intention, it may be aſked why, in remarking on his writings, did they not inſert that portion of the ſentence, which was expreſsly deſigned to convey that idea which they here admit Mr. D. to poſſeſs on the ſubject of ſpiritual worſhip; but more particularly, in that portion of the ſentence which they have quoted, why did they, by leaving out the words by which the preciſe meaning of the author was aſcertained, make themſelves inſtrumental in leading their readers to the contrary concluſion?—And why do they ſtill perſiſt in bringing forward in italics, as expreſſive of my ſentiments on this point, that ſame mutilated quotation, which my firſt Letter to them was written, as the reader has ſeen, for the expreſs purpoſe of *diſclaiming?*"

" The editors proceed to ſay; ' Wiſhing, however, to furniſh Mr. Daubeny with the opportunity he requeſts, of publicly and effectually counteracting the prevalence of that moſt fatal deluſion, into which unguarded language may have been inſtrumental in leading *his* readers, we fully intended, even before we were favoured with his ſecond Letter, to lay his explanation upon the ſubject before the public.' It is as follows; ' I ſay, Sir, that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is *eſſential* to the *perfection* of the Church; ſo far from Chriſtianity being an external thing, a mere form, or the ſpirituality of divine worſhip a matter of no great importance, I conſider that the ſpirituality of it is that thing of *primary importance*, which the being of the Church was deſigned to preſerve; that valuable *kernel*, if I may ſo ſay, of which the conſtitution of the Church is the *ſhell*;' and conſequently (to make uſe of your own words on the ſubject) that ' every kind of religion but *ſpiritual*, is not only defective, but ruinous.'

" If,—inſtead of ſtill attempting to keep alive the deception, into which the editors had led their *own* readers, by their groſs mutilation and conſequent miſrepreſentation of my language; by ſaying, as they now do, that they wiſhed to furniſh Mr. Daubeny ' with the opportunity he requeſts, of publicly and effectually counteracting the prevalence of that moſt fatal deluſion, into which unguarded language may have led *his* readers,'—they had ſaid, we have turned to the paſſage under conſideration, and feel ourſelves called upon to reſtore to Mr. D. his own words, by the omiſſion of which we have led *our* readers into the miſconception of the author's meaning; and we are ſatisfied that Mr. Daubeny's words, as they are to be found in his page, ſpeak a language that ſtands in need of no explanation; they would have written like honeſt men.

' For the editors of the ' Chriſtian Obſerver' muſt have known, that Mr. Daubeny's wiſh for explanation could not refer to the readers of *their publication*, but to thoſe of *his own*; and conſequently muſt apply excluſively to unguarded language of *his own*, ſhould ſuch be to be found in his writings;

not

not to language which had been rendered objectionable *only*, by their notorious and groſs mutilation of it. This would have been to put the matter on its proper ground. In ſuch a caſe they would have done juſtice to the miſrepreſented author. But in ſo doing, they muſt have taken ſhame to themſelves. I am not therefore ſurprized that they ſhould proceed to ſay; 'Our wiſh to decline all perſonal controverſy, prevents our making any comment on the preceding explanation, which is given in Mr. Daubeny's own words. It is with the ſame view, as conceiving it can anſwer no good purpoſe to any of the parties concerned, and not from any diſreſpect to Mr. D. or from any deſire to avoid doing him (as we truſt we have already done him) the moſt ample juſtice, that we decline publiſhing his two letters.'

"To perſonal controverſy, no one can be more indiſpoſed than myſelf. 'I take no joy in ſtriving, I have not been trained up in it.'—But perſonal controverſy has nothing to do with the preſent ſubject. The queſtion is, whether *perſonal miſrepreſentation* does not require *perſonal juſtification* from the *miſrepreſenting* party. Let the mutilation, by which the editors of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver' have diſfigured my language, be withdrawn; and my language on this occaſion will *juſtify itſelf*.

"My firſt Letter to the editors, was expreſsly calculated to produce this effect. It has been withheld from the public, for reaſons that muſt be obvious. But whilſt the editors have kept back my Letter, becauſe they would not, in the ſight of their own readers, tread back their ground; they have, in the number under conſideration, eſtabliſhed the point, for which that Letter contended; they acknowledged that the ſuppoſed quotation, 'that the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is not eſſential to the being of the Church of Chriſt;' which they had in effect denied in the number for April, to be a quotation, was really taken from the paſſage, to which I had referred it; and was therefore (though they do not, *bonâ fide*, admit it to be ſuch) a *mutilated* quotation from the following paſſage, in page 482. 'That the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is eſſential to the *very Being* and *Conſtitution* of a Church is more than will be granted, becauſe the Church of Chriſt has at different times been permitted to exiſt without it.'

"The editors proceed to ſay, 'Conſiderable light ſeemed to us to be thrown on the author's meaning, in the above extract, by what he ſays at page 401 of the ſame work. He there obſerves, addreſſing himſelf to his opponent, 'I mean neither to diſparage nor offend you when I take upon me to aſſert, that you are but a ſcioliſt in theology, if you have yet to learn that, however bold the poſition may ſeem, that may be a *true Church* in which the pure word of God is not preached.'

"Here the editors ſtop.—I therefore take leave to ſubjoin the immediate context, which ſo determinately aſcertains the author's meaning on the occaſion, as to bid defiance to all but wilful miſconception of it. 'It is a Church in error, if you pleaſe, and conſequently not what it ought to be: but error in a Church does not deſtroy its *Conſtitution*. Error may be reformed, and the Church thereby be reſtored to perfection. If you will turn to the Revelations, you will find the Churches of Aſia were accuſed of groſs errors; but their candleſtick was not removed: that is, they did not ceaſe to be Churches till their errors were found to be incorrigible. The Church of Rome, as I have before obſerved from great authority, is a *true Church*, though a Church in which the pure word is not always preached.

As

As ſuch, it is a *corrupt* Church, but is ſtill ſuffered to exiſt as a very conſpicuous branch of the viſible Church of Chriſt.'

" Had there been the leaſt doubt on the mind of the editors of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver' with reſpect to my ſentiments, as they were to be collected from the paſſage in p. 482; a reference to the paſſage in p. 484, which has juſt been laid before the reader, was calculated to clear it up. For from theſe paſſages, properly laid together, it will be evident to every intelligent reader, that what was deemed non-eſſential, was only ſo to be conſidered in the ſenſe *then under conſideration*.

" Admitting, therefore, the editors of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver' to be in any degree competent to the office they have taken upon themſelves, it is impoſſible but they muſt have underſtood the meaning intended to be conveyed in the paſſage, which has become the ſubject of their remark. Still what the author evidently intended ſhould be underſtood in *one ſenſe*, the editors of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver' have thought proper to repreſent *in another*. But the preciſion of the author's language was unfavourable to ſuch miſrepreſentation. This ſtumbling-block muſt therefore be removed. With this view the words inſerted in the paſſage under conſideration for the expreſs purpoſe of marking the author's meaning in ſuch a manner, that it could not poſſibly be miſunderſtood, are omitted, in order that the paſſage might appear to ſpeak as the editors of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver" choſe that it ſhould ſpeak. On this ground the editors proceed to ſay, 'It will ſcarcely ſurprize any unprejudiced perſon, that, on the authority of theſe paſſages, which are in uniſon with the general tenor of Mr. Daubeny's book, we ſhould have aſſerted (an aſſertion which Mr. D. has not contradicted) that his opinion was, that 'the ſpirituality of divine worſhip is not eſſential to the being of the Church of Chriſt.'

" None are ſo blind as they that will not ſee. But unleſs the readers of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver' are blind alſo, they will clearly perceive, that inſtead of thus reproducing a paſſage, under the form of a quotation from my writings, the fallacy of which has been completely and repeatedly pointed out; the editors ſhould have ſaid, after we had caſt Mr. Daubeny's language in our own mould, it cannot ſurprize any intelligent perſon that Mr. D.'s opinion, reſpecting the ſpirituality of divine worſhip, ſhould appear to be what we had faſhioned it.

" I forbear further comment, and, as a party concerned, I leave ſentence in this caſe to be pronounced by the reader. I will only take leave to obſerve, that could the Church be perſonified, and ſpeak for herſelf, ſhe would ſay, 'My cauſe is the cauſe of truth, and the diſtinctive characteriſtic of thoſe, who would do ſervice to it, muſt be, 'αληθευοντες εν αγαπη'— Telling truth in charity.'

" With reſpect to that part of the ſubject on which the editors of the 'Chriſtian Obſerver' have committed themſelves by their reference to the 19th Article; if they have yet to learn how to diſcriminate between a *true* Church and a *pure* Church, as they appear indiſpoſed to receive my teſtimony, I will refer them to authority, which I have long been taught to reverence, that of pious Biſhop Hall, who in his RECONCILER has fully eſtabliſhed this point. 'Though I fear, with this great ornament of our Church, that it is an unreaſonable motion to requeſt minds prepoſſeſſed with prejudice to hear reaſon: For whole volumes are nothing to ſuch as have contented themſelves to take up opinions upon truſt, and will hold them becauſe they know where they had them. In vain therefore ſhould

I ſpend

I ſpend myſelf in beating upon ſuch anvils; but for thoſe ingenuous Chriſtians, which will hold an ear open for juſtice and truth, I hope I have ſaid enough, if ought at all needed."

The Public will now decide between the author of the "Guide to the Church" and the Conductors of "the Chriſtian Obſerver; and what that deciſion will be it is very eaſy to conjecture. All Diſſenters and Schiſmatics will unite with the latter, and all the true members of the Eſtabliſhed Church will ſupport the cauſe of truth, and join the former.

"The uniform deſign of my writings (ſays Mr. Daubeny) has been to maintain the *divine* conſtitution of the Church eſtabliſhed in this country, with the view of counteracting, as far as may be, that growing ſeparation from it, which threatens deſtruction to the Chriſtian cauſe; and that Chriſtians being thereby led into the way of truth, might (in the language of our Church) "hold the faith in unity of ſpirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteouſneſs of life."—Such a deſign, to all ſound Members of the Church, is of a nature ſufficiently intereſting to inſure the welcome reception of any writings tolerably competent to the execution of it; whilſt to Diſſenters, and Separatiſts of every deſcription, it cannot fail to render them in a proportionate degree exceptionable. By perſons of this claſs I had to expect that all poſſible advantage would be taken of every unguarded poſition; that my arguments would occaſionally be puſhed beyond their proper bearing, and concluſions drawn from them to which they were never meant to lead. In the judgment of ſuch perſons it was to be expected, that the ſyſtematic defence of a Church eſtabliſhment, conſidered as a divine inſtitution, would not fail to be ranked among the productions of profeſſional bigotry, the feeble offſpring of a *narrow* mind; inconſiſtent with that boaſted liberality of ſentiment, under which the independent and licentious ſpirit of the times has been long attempting to conceal its deformity. And in theſe expectations, I muſt confeſs, I have not been much diſappointed."

Mr. D. thus farther explains his notions of the Eſtabliſhed Church, with which we beg leave to expreſs our hearty concurrence, founded on a full conviction of their accuracy and truth.

"The object of the divine eſtabliſhment of the Church, is there repreſented to have been the ſecurity and preſervation of Chriſtian truth in the world. Hence the Church has been diſtinguiſhed in Scripture, by the title of 'the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.' Now the preſervation of Chriſtian truth in the Church, could have no other object in view, than the ſpiritual edification of her Members; that increaſing in grace, and in the knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt, through the uſe of divinely appointed means, they might grow up into 'Temples of the living God.'—Such then being the end, and ſuch the means deſigned to lead to it, all compariſon between the *means* and the *end*, under the plauſible diſtinctive title of the *circumſtantials* and *eſſentials* of religion, was conſidered by me as totally irrelevant; becauſe theſe circumſtantials and eſſentials are two parts of the ſame divine plan, which were never deſigned to exiſt, but in a ſtate of ſtrict connection with each other. The circumſtantials and eſſentials of religion therefore, having, by divine wiſdom, been made mutually dependant, being under God mutually preſervative of each other's exiſtence in the world; all attempt to ſeparate between them, under the notion of attaining to a ſuperior degree of perfection in ſpiritual things, appears to be a part of that plauſible deception, by which many well-meaning Chriſtians are at this time beguiled, by the great Adverſary of the Church; who, in this caſe,

caſe, aſſumes the ſhape of an angel of light, for the purpoſe of more effectually promoting his own ruinous deſigns.

"The hiſtory of the ſeventeenth century, having given a pretty clear inſight into this Adverſary's game, as it was once played th ough in this kingdom, it becomes the imperious duty of the clergy, as engaged on the oppoſite ſide, to endeavour, by timely counteracting it, to prevent a repetition of its fatal ſucceſs. With this view, one object of my Guide was to guard againſt that ſpecious (and I am ſorry to ſay prevailing) fallacy, by which many well-intentioned minds have been led into irregularities, which on other accounts, they might not wiſh to countenance; from a miſtaken opinion, that the ſuppoſed purity of religious worſhip, ſuperceded the attention neceſſary to be paid to the divine eſtabliſhment of it. This notion was conſidered to be ſo ſubverſive of that regular order, by which the Church, as a ſpiritual ſociety, was to be maintained in being; and ſo certainly ultimately deſtructive of the great object of its inſtitution; that pains were taken, in different parts of the work, to perſuade my fellow Chriſtians, (as in duty bound to do) that the bleſſed Author of religion at all times knew by what means the knowledge of it was to be beſt preſerved in the world: that under every diſpenſation, He had not failed to provide accordingly; and that by our conformity to the divine proviſion, we might reſt ſatisfied, that the end deſigned to be anſwered by it, would be moſt effectually ſecured. The obvious concluſion from which premiſes, appears to be this; that as the all-wiſe Being, 'Who knows what is in man,' not only knew beſt how to provide for the circumſtances of the party, for whoſe ſervice the Church was inſtituted; but from the relation in which man ſtands to Him, has moreover a right to exact obedience to his inſtitution; it is incumbent on all men, who would not preſume to be wiſer than their Maker, to avail themſelves with gratitude, of that aſſiſtance, which the eſtabliſhment of a Church on earth miniſters to our fallen condition; and not to run the riſk of ſacrificing that good, which it is ſo well calculated to produce, to vain dreams of more ſpiritual perfection, in ways of their own deviſing."

Having fully expoſed the "polemical diſhoneſty" of the Chriſtian Obſerver, our author proceeds with his own juſtification.

"Having thus ſtated the fact, and I truſt fairly, I ſhould content myſelf with leaving the judgment upon it to any candid mind, did not a reference to the 19th Article furniſh me with ſome inſight into the ground on which the 'Obſerver's' objection to my opinion, which he ſtill looks upon as *erroneous*, has been built. 'We would refer Mr. D. (ſay the editors of the periodical publication in queſtion) for our opinion on the ſubject of his Letter, to the 19th Article.'—The 19th Article points out the two characteriſtics, by which the viſible Church is to be known on earth; namely, *purity of doctrine*, and a *right adminiſtration of the ſacraments*, according to Chriſt's ordinance. What our Church intends by the right adminiſtration of the ſacraments, no one can be at a loſs to know, who compares her Canons and Articles with each other. By the former, ſhe gives her Miniſters to underſtand,* that "no meetings, aſſemblies, or congregations of the King's born ſubjects, but thoſe of the Eſtabliſhed Church, may rightly challenge to themſelves the name of *true* and *lawful* Churches.' By the

"* See 9th, 10th, and 11th Canons.

latter,

latter, ſhe informs them, that 'it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or miniſtering the ſacraments, before he be *lawfully* called and ſent to execute the ſame: and that thoſe ought to be conſidered as lawfully called and ſent, which be choſen and called to this work by men, who have public authority given unto them in the congregation' for that purpoſe.—Art. 23.

"The Church of England, at the ſame time that ſhe denies infallibility to belong to any Church on earth, challenges to herſelf the title of a *true* and *lawful* Church, on the ground of her poſſeſſing the two characteriſtics by which the viſible Church is to be known. The 19th Article, in its immediate reference to the Church of Rome, in which light it is principally to be viewed, may be conſidered therefore as a public vindication on the part of the Church of England of that title, to which ſhe lays claim. Whilſt, therefore, the Church of England does not diſpute the ground on which the Church of Rome is permitted to ſtand, ſhe thinks herſelf juſtified, as an independent Chriſtian Society, poſſeſſing in herſelf the eſſential characteriſtics of a *true Church*, to ſeparate from the Church of Rome as a *Church in Error*.

"That this is the point of view in which this ſubject was meant to be ſeen by our Church, is thus proved by her ſubſequent practice. Should, for inſtance, a Preſbyter of the Scotch Kirk, or any other Separatiſt from our Church, offer to miniſter in her congregations, he muſt firſt qualify himſelf for that purpoſe, by receiving a commiſſion conferred upon him by epiſcopal ordination; whilſt a Roman Catholic Prieſt on the recantation of his errors, is thereby conſidered to be fully qualified for the diſcharge of every miniſterial function. In the one caſe, the Church, on the ſuppoſition that ſhe admits the doctrine, rejects the *man*, for want of the neceſſary commiſſion to preach it. In the other, error having been formally renounced, and the purity of doctrine aſcertained, ſhe admits the man to her Miniſtry, *by virtue of the commiſſion*, of which he is already in poſſeſſion. Whence it appears, that according to the ſenſe of our Church on this ſubject, purity of doctrine does not ſupply the defect of commiſſion; nor is the acknowledged validity of commiſſion, in the caſe of the Roman Catholic Prieſt, admitted to be a paſſport to notorious error. Conſequently both theſe qualifications muſt be conſidered as *co-exiſting* in the ſame perſon, to entitle him to the character of being a true Miniſter of the Church.

"And with this view of the ſubject our conſtitution in State as well as Church will be found to correſpond. According to the conſtitution of the latter *every perſon*, not *epiſcopally ordained*, is conſidered to be a *Layman*:—Whilſt the language of our Statute Book furniſhes but one title for perſons officiating in holy things; namely, that of *Clericus*, or *Clerk*; which is excluſively appropriated to Miniſters *epiſcopally ordained*.—Thus much for the 19th Article, according to the ſenſe *originally* intended to be conveyed by it."

On the ſubject of the neceſſity of *epiſcopal ordination*, to prevent a perſon from being conſidered as a *Layman*, we are happy to avail ourſelves of the authority of this true "Guide to the Church," in ſupport of a remonſtrance which we have to addreſs to our critical competitors, *the British Critics*. In their "acknowledgment to correſpondents," in their number for June laſt, they make ſome brief remarks on the letter of Mr. Spencer, of Wells, inſerted in our Review for May. Mr. S. had called on them to give up Mrs. More, agreeably to their former declaration, that they would do ſo, if ſhe

were proved to be a *Methodist*; a proof which we thought was afforded by the fact of her having received the Sacrament from a Diſſenting Miniſter. But, ſay the critics, we "are by no means convinced that going to a meeting of *diſſenters* or *independents*, ſuch as Mr. Jay's, can be any proof of methodiſm." Here they are *literally* right, but *morally* wrong. They well knew, that the grand point in diſpute was the ſincerity of Mrs. More's attachment to the eſtabliſhed church, and that therefore the fact of her having frequented for years, and received the ſacrament at, a meeting of independents or diſſenters, was as fully deciſive of the queſtion, as if ſuch meeting had been a meeting of methodiſts. In ſhort, we defy them to ſhew that "a proof of going to Lady Huntingdon's chapel" would have been more to the purpoſe, when fairly ſtated, without evaſion or ſubterfuge, than that of going to Mr. Jay's. But our concern at witneſſing ſuch *equivocation*, for we cannot poſſibly conſider it in any other light, great as it was, was ſtill much leſs than our aſtoniſhment at the aſſertion, that "*Mr. Jay is not a Layman*," becauſe, forſooth, he is "in the orders of *his* church." Such an aſſertion from clergymen, and *dignitaries*, of the Eſtabliſhed Church, we certainly never did expect to hear. We affirm, in direct contradiction to them, but in uniſon with Mr. Daubeny and with every other ſound divine of the Church of England, that not only Mr. *Jay*, but every man who has not been ordained by a Biſhop, is a *Layman*. And in no other light can he be conſidered in conformity with the diſcipline and doctrine of the Eſtabliſhed Church. It is nothing to us that this broad propoſition includes "Dr. Leland, Dr. Doddrige, Dr. Lardner, &c." It is a truth which no epiſcopalian can deny, and which we challenge the *British Critics* to confute or overturn. "None may ordain *but only Biſhops*," ſaid the eminently pious and learned Hooker, as Macarius and Epiphanius had ſaid before him. "By the impoſition of *their* hands it is, that the church giveth power of order, both unto preſbyters and deacons." And all who have not *ſo* received ſuch power are *Laymen*. When they whoſe peculiar duty it is to protect and defend the eſtabliſhment againſt its numerous enemies, make ſuch unwarrantable and dangerous conceſſions as this, where are we to look for conſiſtency or firmneſs, in reſiſting the encroachments of ſectaries?

We now return from this digreſſion to Mr. Daubeny, who, after explaining his ideas of *ſpiritual worſhip*, and juſtly obſerving that it has been his uniform endeavour to make the ſervice of the Church of England inſtrumental, under God, to the great end to which it was deſigned to miniſter, moſt pertinently adds:

"But with this view I do not, as ſome of our brethren, to the diſgrace of the profeſſion, are in the habit of doing, go out of the Church under the ſpecious pretence of ſeeking that ſpiritual worſhip, which, if they were not wanting to the duty they owe to the Church, and to its members, might be found in much greater perfection within its walls. In the language of pious Biſhop Hall, 'I do not, with weak, ignorant, ſeduced ſouls, run to ſeek this Dove in a foreign cote; ſhe is here in the Church of England, one of the moſt conſpicuous Members of the Catholic Church upon earth, if ſhe have any neſt under Heaven.'

"And, when I conſider the deſcription given by Euſebius of the primitive Church in its early days, in the following words: 'There was one and the ſame power of the holy Spirit, which paſſed through all the Members; one ſoul in all; the ſame alacrity of faith; one common conſent in chaunting forth the praiſes of God;' I conceive that a conformity with this

primitive

primitive pattern, is the object our Church has in view in her excellent Liturgy; and conſequently *that eſſential object* which every ſound Miniſter of that Church muſt feel himſelf pledged to promote."

Here we muſt take our leave of this pious, intelligent, and inſtructive writer, whoſe active efforts, both by precept and example, to ſupport the Eſtabliſhed Church, and conſequently to promote the eſſential objects and intereſts of Chriſtianity, entitle him to the warmeſt gratitude of all its friends and followers, and juſtify the wiſh, that the faithful *Guide* may be inveſted with that portion of power and authority which would give additional weight and efficacy to his future exertions. The Epiſcopal Church of America has, as we learn from private communications from that country, paſſed an unanimous vote of approbation, of the "Guide to the Church;" a vote which reflects equal honour on the author and themſelves. We are rather ſurprized that our tranſatlantic brethren ſhould not have been anticipated in this tribute of juſtice, by a more marked and unequivocal applauſe, on the part of our own prelates.—Theſe are not times for a temporizing policy, either in church or ſtate.

MISCELLANEOUS.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

IN peruſing the various contents of your well intended and very uſeful Miſcellany, every ſerious reader muſt perceive how much injury is done to the cauſe of truth and order in matters of religion, by the manner in which the profeſſed friends of both are apt to miſtake and miſrepreſent each other, according to the different views of the parties, to which they reſpectively belong. This unhappy propenſity may no doubt be conſidered as ariſing in general from the weakneſs and depravity of human nature, but in many inſtances may be more particularly traced to the prevalence of thoſe worldly paſſions and prejudices, which are too often allowed to mingle themſelves with an apparent zeal for the intereſts even of pure, undefiled religion.—I have been led into this unpleaſant train of reflection by an angry letter which appeared in your laſt Appendix, ſigned *An Engliſh Clergyman*, and complaining very bitterly of "an unprovoked attack upon the character of thoſe clergymen of the Church of England, who officiate in congregations of *their own perſuaſion* in Scotland." At the very outſet of this charge, I feel myſelf at ſome loſs to know the character of thoſe perſons who are thought to be injured by ſuch an "unprovoked attack."—May I be allowed to aſk, Does this expreſſion "*congregations of their own perſuaſion*," mean congregations formed and conſtituted, as the Church of England directs? Or does it mean congregations formed and conſtituted according to the *particular perſuaſion* or *opinion* of thoſe clergymen of the Church of England preſently officiating in Scotland? The former meaning it cannot have; for the Church of England holds no other language than that of Ignatius, "Let nothing be done without the biſhop." It muſt therefore have the latter meaning only; and that is ſo contrary to the ſenſe of the ſame church, as expreſſed in her 34th article, that it will be difficult to ſcreen thoſe from her "open rebuke," who through their own "*private* judgment, *willingly* and *purpoſely*, do thus openly break the traditions

ditions and ceremonies of the church, which be not repugnant to the word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority."

But, whatever be the character of the objects of it, the attack complained of is ſaid to have been made by an A. B. of Edinburgh, who in your Review for January laſt, addreſſed you on the ſubject of your criticiſm on Dr. Campbell's Lectures, and took that opportunity, it ſeems, of conveying ſome remarks on the conduct of theſe clergymen "in terms not very polite, or even civil," according to this writer, "who, as he has the honour to be one of thoſe men, whom A. B. has thought proper to denominate intruders, and to charge with depredation, cannot" he ſays, "ſit ſilent under a charge ſo general, ſo direct, and ſo undeſerved, without attempting to vindicate an inoffenſive body of men from ſuch an aſperſion." A ſimilar motive has induced me to take up my pen on the preſent occaſion: and though I am not called upon to vindicate this ſuppoſed attack, by any knowledge of its author, having never heard who he is, I yet feel it my duty to do juſtice to his intention, and to reſcue him, if I can, from the ſevere imputation of wiſhing to give any juſt cauſe of offence to thoſe whom he ſeems anxious to conciliate, and to bring them over, if poſſible, to the communion of "that church for which he appears ſo zealous an advocate." In that character, if his zeal has prompted him to make uſe of ſtronger language than prudence perhaps would dictate, ſome allowance is to be made for the effects of that honeſt ſurpriſe, which was naturally excited by his obſerving clergymen, who had been regularly ordained, acting a part, as he thought, ſo inconſiſtent with their profeſſion, and ſo different from what might be expected from their avowed principles. Viewing their conduct in this light, we need not much wonder, that it ſhould be treated with ſome degree of aſperity and blunt reprehenſion, by a perſon who acknowledges his "ſituation in life to be low and obſcure, and that he has not the ſmalleſt pretenſions to learning or abilities;" eſpecially when we obſerve the ſame rough unpoliſhed ſtyle, and much more bitterneſs of expreſſion, adopted by one who calls himſelf an *Engliſh Clergyman*, and as ſuch, ought to preſerve a due regard to decency and good manners, as well as to truth and charity.

Let us examine then, if you pleaſe, how far this has been attended to in the caſe before us, and conſider this *Clergyman*'s defenſive arguments, if, indeed, they deſerve that name, when conſiſting of bold denials, and no leſs confident aſſertions jumbled together with ſuch confuſion of ideas, as renders it no eaſy matter to mould them into any regular form. But let the gentleman ſpeak for himſelf, leſt I ſhould be ſuſpected of doing him injuſtice. "I do not mean, he ſays, "to retort A. B.'s ill language, or imitate his aſperity; but ſome of his aſſertions I muſt deny, becauſe they lead to miſchievous conſequences; and others I may be bold to contradict, becauſe, if I am not miſtaken, A. B. knows them to be falſe." After this explanation of his deſign, the firſt inſtance produced in ſupport of it is, A. B.'s taking for granted, that any one acquainted with hiſtory, muſt alſo conſider the church as being diſtinct from, and independent of, all other ſocieties." And if it had not been ſo, I know not how it could have ſubſiſted for the firſt three hundred years after Chriſt, when all other ſocieties were againſt it, and yet received no injury from it. One ſhould think this were a very harmleſs and well-founded opinion, and not likely to "lead to any miſchievous conſequence." But here is a *clergyman*, who ſees it in a different light, "as an inſinuation meant to ſhew, that any church *calling*

itſelf

itſelf epiſcopal is perfectly intitled to the protection of government, though its miniſters refuſe ſubmiſſion to the laws and ordinances of the ſtate." This is the firſt time I ever heard of ſuch a diſcovery, and I leave it, Sir, to you and your readers, to determine, whether the concluſion be warranted.

It was the validity of the orders of the Scottiſh biſhops which A. B. was contending for, not the protection of government, as due to any rebellious church, merely becauſe it may chooſe to *call itſelf* epiſcopal. Yet our ſagacious adverſary "verily believes that the Scottiſh epiſcopal clergy think ſo!" "But where," he adds, "did they learn the principle?" And ſo he might well aſk; for I have been one of them near forty years, and can truly ſay, I never was taught in this manner, nor could in all that time diſcover the leaſt tendency to ſuch a principle among thoſe with whom I have been officially connected. But our accuſer goes on with this heavy charge againſt us. How well he is qualified to ſupport it let his own friends be judges. "The church of England," he tells us, "is contented and happy in its connection with the other legal eſtabliſhments of the ſtate; is glad to have kings for nurſing fathers, and queens for nurſing mothers! and accordingly obliges all orders of the miniſtry to ſwear allegiance to the ſovereign upon the throne, and to utter and ſubſcribe a declaration of conformity to the liturgy of the church of England, *as it is by law eſtabliſhed.* Theſe things the Scottiſh epiſcopal clergy do not."—And no wonder that they do not, if ſuch things are done by the church of England, *only* in return for thoſe ſplendid privileges which are here ſo pompouſly diſplayed, and of which our poor church is totally deſtitute, yet not the leſs anxious and earneſt in her prayers to God, that the church of England may long be bleſſed with the full enjoyment of them. Such being the difference of ſituation in the two churches, it is not to be ſuppoſed that the ſame obligations can in every reſpect apply to both; and in this country, where the liturgy of the church of England *is not by law eſtabliſhed,* I do not ſee on what ground *that* church can enforce a conformity to it in Scotland, or why the Scotch epiſcopal clergy ſhould be thus reviled for not doing things which ſurely the church of England never required of them. But "their biſhops," we are told, "have unanimouſly refuſed to do them, and therefore they may well argue for their independence of all other ſocieties."

Having the honour to be one of theſe biſhops, I ſhould be glad to know what it really is that we have unanimouſly refuſed to do, or how we can poſſibly make that refuſal an argument for our being independent of *all other ſocieties?* Does this gentleman really mean, that becauſe "the *church of England* obliges *all orders of the miniſtry* to ſwear allegiance to the ſovereign upon the throne, and to utter and ſubſcribe a declaration of conformity to her liturgy," therefore *we,* as a part of the miniſtry, are obliged to comply with what ſhe requires, to ſhew that we are not independent of her? or is he not rather confounding the authority of the church with that of the ſtate, and wiſhing to accuſe us of diſaffection to government, and thereby expoſe us to puniſhment for refuſing to ſwear allegiance to the ſovereign upon the throne? An accuſation as falſe as it appears to be malicious; for I can aſſure him that we do not refuſe any ſuch thing; nor is it poſſible that we could, with any conſiſtency, refuſe to ſwear *allegiance* to a ſovereign for whom we ſolemnly and ſincerely pray, in the very words of the Engliſh liturgy, that "God would be his defender and keeper, and give him the victory over all his enemies." During the late awful conteſt in

which our country was engaged, whatever aid government could derive from the public ſolemnities of religion, eſpecially thoſe appointed by royal authority, was regularly afforded in our ſacred aſſemblies, and on all ſuch occaſions our clergy exerted themſelves to the utmoſt in promoting thoſe ſalutary meaſures which were from time to time adopted for preſerving the internal peace of the kingdom, as well as its ſecurity from every hoſtile invaſion. Every order of council iſſued for this purpoſe has been carefully attended to on our part, and this very day we have been all yielding a dutiful obedience to the late royal proclamation, by offering up our public thanks to Almighty God for enabling his majeſty to bring to a favourable concluſion the moſt arduous ſtruggle that ever was maintained for the preſervation of ſocial order, and for preventing, what we had ſo much reaſon to fear, the diſſemination of anarchy and confuſion, and every evil work.

To the king, as our rightful ſovereign, and to his royal family, as pledges of a happy ſucceſſion to his crown and dignity, we feel ourſelves attached by all the ties of conſcience, as well as gratitude, and make it our conſtant ſtudy to impreſs on the minds of thoſe who adhere to our miniſtry, that juſt and becoming regard to the laws and conſtitution of our country which is ſo eſſential to the character of dutiful and loyal ſubjects. For the truth of all this, we may appeal to the teſtimony of thoſe who frequent our places of public worſhip: and they are now attended by peers of the realm, by lords lieutenants, and their deputies in the ſeveral counties, by officers of every rank in the army, and civil magiſtrates in town and country;—all theſe being perfectly ſenſible that his majeſty has no better ſubjects, nor perſons more attached to his government on principles of permanent loyalty, than the biſhops and clergy of the Scottiſh epiſcopal church.

Does it then appear to you, Sir, or to any of your readers, that we ſtand in need of the warning which this "Engliſh Clergyman" gives us, "not to ſtep forth to expoſe ourſelves and our diſloyal principles, by traducing others, who do not incur the ſame reproach?" We feel no inclination to return evil for evil, or to be guilty of traducing even our bitterest enemies. But if we were diſpoſed to retaliate, an inſtance could be produced, as this gentleman muſt know, becauſe it was the ſubject of a public proſecution, which might very well juſtify our returning the charge of diſloyalty to that very quarter where he would make us believe no ſuch reproach has ever been incurred. With regard to the validity of our orders, the adverſary we have juſt now to contend with very wiſely declines to enter the liſts on that ſubject and wiſhes it to "reſt in peace," as conſcious that it cannot be awakened with any credit to thoſe who would pretend to call in queſtion a point as clearly eſtabliſhed as any ſucceſſion of orders at this day in the chriſtian church. He is however much offended at A. B. for having ſaid that the Engliſh biſhops, as ſuch, "have no authority in Scotland, and calls this a propoſition which would prove too much, and therefore proves nothing." The manner in which he attempts to make good this curious aſſertion is worthy of the purpoſe for which it is brought forward, and ſhews what ſtrange notions this "Clergyman" entertains of epiſcopal ordination. "When I received my orders," ſays he, "from an Engliſh biſhop, I was authorized to read and preach the goſpel in the congregation where I ſhould be *lawfully appointed thereunto.* I truſt, I am, according to the act of toleration, lawfully called and appointed to read and preach the goſpel in Scotland." *Toleration*, according to Dr. Johnſon, is "*allowance given to that which is not approved*;" this ingenious philologiſt reads it—"*a lawful call and*

appointment

appointment;" not quite agreeable, however, to what the church of England ſays, in her xxiii. article. "It is not *lawful* for any man to take upon him the office of public preacher, or miniſtering the ſacraments in the congregation, before he be *lawfully* called and *ſent* to execute the ſame. And thoſe we ought to judge *lawfully called* and *ſent*, which be choſen and called to this work by men who have *public authority* given unto them in the congregation, to call and ſend miniſters into the Lord's vineyard" There is no reference here to any *act of toleration*, or indeed to any act whatever, but that of Chriſt and his apoſtles, as laying the foundation of that *lawful appointment* alluded to in the ordination office: which ſurely implies, that a perſon, even when ordained by a biſhop, muſt, by the ſame, or ſome other biſhop, be lawfully or *regularly appointed* to the charge of a congregation, before he can take upon him to read and preach the goſpel in it.

This is abſolutely neceſſary upon epiſcopal principles, and has always been eſteemed ſo, in every ſound and well regulated part of the Chriſtian Church. Yet here is a man, who calls himſelf an *Engliſh*, and no doubt thinks himſelf an *epiſcopal clergyman*, and yet denies the truth of this venerable maxim, ſo eſſential to the order and unity of the church, nay, boaſts of his acting in direct oppoſition to it, and aſſures us, that "according to the Act of Toleration, he truſts he is *lawfully* called and *appointed* to read and preach the Goſpel in Scotland," without authority from any Biſhop, yea, in open contempt of the only authority of that kind, which can be obtained in this country. For, whatever he may ſuppoſe to be the miſchievous conſequence of ſuch a "propoſition," I have never yet heard, that any congregation in Scotland forms a part of an Engliſh dioceſe, and will think myſelf obliged to him for the diſcovery, if he will but name the Biſhop at preſent on the Engliſh bench, who claims or exerciſes any kind of eccleſiaſtical authority in this part of the united kingdom. But there is ſtill a queſtion put by this puzzling divine, which, he probably imagines, it will be very difficult to anſwer:—"If epiſcopal ordination goes no farther than the dioceſe or diſtrict where it was conferred, how came the Biſhops of Scotland to conſecrate a Biſhop for America?" But what Biſhop of Scotland, or of any part of the church, ever ſuppoſed, that the effect of epiſcopal ordination was to be thus limited? Does not our daily practice in removing clergymen from one dioceſe to another, when ſuch removals are found expedient, plainly evince the contrary? Yet this is always done with due regard to the authority of the dioceſan; and no clergyman is ſettled in any charge, but with the expreſs conſent and licence of the ordinary of the place, where ſuch charge lies. In the Conſecration of Biſhops, it is obvious, that one National Church muſt aſſiſt another, when ſuch brotherly aid becomes neceſſary, either for introducing or preſerving an epiſcopal ſucceſſion; and, agreeably to thoſe apoſtolic rules, which laid the foundation of this ſucceſſion, was the firſt Proteſtant Biſhop conſecrated for America, with all the proper recommendations, and at the earneſt requeſt of the epiſcopal clergy of the State of Connecticut, over whom he was to preſide. As ſoon as the United States were furniſhed with a ſufficient number of Biſhops, for carrying on the epiſcopal order, the aid or interference of any other church became unneceſſary; and the Biſhops of Scotland will always be happy in maintaining that bond of Chriſtian fellowſhip with their brethren in America, by which all the ſound parts of the body of Chriſt ought to be knit together in peace, and love, and unity. It is on the ſame principle, that we hold ourſelves to be in communion with

the Church of England, and take every opportunity of manifeſting our earneſt deſire to be conſidered in that light. Your angry correſpondent will not allow that this is the caſe, at leaſt with reſpect to thoſe who, though reſiding in Scotland, are not ſatisfied with being in communion with, but affirm themſelves to be even a part of the Church of England. Towards the concluſion of his letter he ſays—"That the Scottiſh Biſhops have repeatedly invited us to join in communion with them, I would wiſh to believe, becauſe A. B. ſo pathetically aſſerts it, did I not know the contrary to be the fact."—I am glad, however, to learn, that he would wiſh to believe it on any account, as, I hope, to convince him, that the contrary is not ſo much the fact as he imagines. As a proof that it is ſo, he indeed tells us—"I have lived in Scotland ſome years, and never heard ſuch coalition propoſed, except in one place (a country town) and there the Engliſh epiſcopal congregation did indeed reject the propoſal, becauſe the Scottiſh biſhop would inſiſt on the introduction of his own liturgy and uſages, which they know to be contrary both to the doctrine and diſcipline of the church of England." Here is a ſtring of facts on which I muſt beg leave to offer a few remarks, obſerving the order in which they are laid before us. That this gentleman has lived in Scotland ſome years I have no doubt; though if that be the caſe, I muſt think it ſtrange, that "he has never heard ſuch coalition propoſed," as he here alludes to, except in one country town, ſince it certainly was propoſed even in the capital of Scotland ſome years ago; and the propoſal, though for a while delayed, was then, and ſtill is, countenanced by ſome very reſpectable characters. Nay, ſuch a coalition was not only propoſed, but actually took place, about ten years ago, in the chief town of a county, and has lately been carried into effect in a country pariſh of this dioceſe, with the entire approbation of all concerned. What "country town" it was in which the "Engliſh epiſcopal congregation rejected the propoſal," I know not, but am poſitively certain, that the rejection was not occaſioned by "the Scottiſh biſhop's inſiſting on the introduction of his own liturgy and uſes," becauſe there is no biſhop in Scotland that has a liturgy of his own. The liturgy we all make uſe of, in our morning and evening ſervice, is preciſely that of the church of England; and the Scotch communion office, which was firſt authorized by Charles I. can hardly be ſaid "to be contrary to the *doctrine* and *diſcipline* of that church, when it has been warmly approved of by many of her moſt eminent divines, as perfectly agreeable to the uſage of the primitive church, and ſuch as can give no cauſe of offence to any well-inſtructed chriſtian. Yet, ſo far from inſiſting on the uſe of this office, the Scottiſh biſhops, in all the propoſals that they have made with regard to the ſo much deſired union, have uniformly agreed, that every Engliſh clergyman, joining in communion with them, ſhall continue, if he thinks proper, to uſe the office to which he has been accuſtomed, and be ſubjected to nothing that can in the leaſt interfere with the obligations he came under when he received his orders from an Engliſh biſhop. Such are the terms, on which we are not only willing, but anxious to receive theſe Engliſh clergymen into our communion: and, if we have not given an invitation to that purpoſe in ſuch a general or public manner as ſeems to be required of us, it is merely becauſe we know not how to addreſs them as a body, or how far ſuch an addreſs would be well received by them. If they will only give us ground to believe, that they are no longer diſpoſed to maintain that unhappy ſeparation, by which we have been kept at a diſtance from each other, they

will

will find us equally forward to put an end to ſuch unbecoming diviſion, and glad to embrace the means by which all our former differences may be buried in oblivion.

Your journal, it may be ſaid, is not the proper channel through which this information ought to be conveyed. But there can be no harm in making uſe of it for the purpoſe of exciting ſome farther deſire of communication in a friendly manner on both ſides; and with that view I ſhall affix my name and place of abode to what I am now writing, and conclude my obſervations on this intereſting ſubject in the words of another periodical publication, in which I find theſe very juſt and pertinent remarks, (ſee *British Critic* for December, 1801, p. 601.) "It is indeed a very ſingular phenomenon in the hiſtory of the church, that in Scotland there are two diſtinct bodies of epiſcopalians, who hold the ſame profeſſion of faith; make uſe of the ſame liturgy; pay allegiance to the ſame ſovereign; and acknowledge the obligation of the ſame duties, civil and religious; and yet keep aloof from each others' communion! A Romiſh prieſt, ordained in Spain, pays, in this country, canonical obedience to the Catholic biſhop of the diſtrict in which he reſides: A Scotch Preſbyterian miniſter, when in the north of Ireland, officiates in communion with the claſſes, or preſbytery, within the bounds of which his chapel happens to be ſituated: in the primitive church no ſtrange preſbyter was ever permitted to diſcharge the duties of his function, unleſs he had brought from the biſhop of the dioceſe which he had left, dimiſſory letters addreſſed to the biſhop of the dioceſe in which he meant to fix his reſidence; but in Scotland, it ſeems, there are many clergymen, who, having received epiſcopal orders in England or Ireland, officiate in contempt of the biſhop of the dioceſe, becauſe epiſcopacy in Scotland is not eſtabliſhed by law! Such conduct is, indeed, as Mr. Daubeny ſays, '*unique* in its kind, and unprecedented in the church.' It is not only what in eccleſiaſtical language is called *ſchism*, but it is a direct violation of that law, obedience to which was to be the characteriſtic of our Saviour's diſciples. 'By this ſhall all men know that ye are my diſciples, if ye have love one to another. St. John, xiii. 35."

With my fervent prayers for the increaſe of this truly chriſtian diſpoſition, and every good wiſh for the ſucceſs of your excellent work, I am, Sir,

Your conſtant reader, and very faithful humble ſervant,

Aberdeen, June 17, 1802. JOHN SKINNER.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

AT length *Napoleone Buonaparté* has ſet the ſeal to his power, by cauſing himſelf to be proclaimed Conſul for life, and by aſſuming the ſtrange and unheard of authority to nominate his ſucceſſor, to keep that nomination ſecret as long as he may chuſe, to change it as often as he ſhall pleaſe, or, finally, to bequeath the Gallic empire, by his laſt will and teſtament, to his heirs, executors or aſſigns, as his own fee-ſimple. This is ſubſtantially the fact, for the mummery of conſulting about one eighth part of the population of the country, and of ſubmitting the queſtion to the deliberation of a ſenate, compoſed of his own creatures and tools, whoſe oppoſition to his will, would be ſpeedily followed by baniſhment or death, is too ridiculous for ſerious notice. The affected prudery, and hypocritical cant, diſplayed

diſplayed in the Conſul's anſwer to the Conſervative Senate, on receiving the communication of their memorable *Conſultum*, form an exact counterpart to the ſcene between *our* tyrant, the third Richard, and the Mayor and Aldermen of London, as delineated by Shakeſpeare. An attempt was made, ſome years ago, to waſh *our* Blackmoor white; and, no doubt, ſome Horace Walpole, of the twentieth century, will do the ſame friendly office for the Corſican Moor, and probably with the ſame ſucceſs.

Perhaps thoſe ſtrange, perverſe, infatuated ſpirits, who conceived Citizen Napoleone to be a friend to freedom, imagined that having ſecured the *duration* of his power, he would immediately deſtroy every veſtige of revolutionary deſpotiſm, and eſtabliſh ſuch a ſyſtem of government in its ſtead, as ſhould in deed, and in truth, exhibit to the aſtoniſhed world, "the moſt ſtupendous monument of human happineſs which had ever been reared by human wiſdom;" and ſo realize the patriotic dreams of that "*firſt of ſtatesmen*," Mr. Charles Fox. If ſuch hopes were really entertained, they muſt have been completely deſtroyed the moment the precious charter of Gallic liberty, formed by the fiat of the Corſican Conſul, was announced to the gaping multitude. We have ſubmitted to the diſguſting talk of peruſing and reperuſing this twentieth, or thirtieth, new conſtitution, to which the *Sovereign People* of the great and emancipated nation have been commanded to ſwear obedience. Such a maſs of political imbecility and profligacy never before diſgraced a nation, claiming any rank among the civilized ſtates of the globe; it is infinitely worſe than any of the preceding revolutionary codes, abſurd and arbitrary as moſt of them were. In vain does the friend of rational freedom look for that diſcrimination of powers, that definition of duty, that official reſponſibility, and that *legal* dependence, without which no political independence, no public liberty, can poſſibly exiſt; theſe means of ſecurity to the ſubject, theſe guards of ſocial happineſs, theſe protectors of civil rights, are no where to be found in the Conſular charter. It exhibits one rude, though not *indigeſted*, maſs of harſh, diſguſting, iron deſpotiſm. Through every part of it, in the minuteſt regulations, as in its moſt important proviſions, nothing is ſeen but the CONSUL; in HIM is virtually united the whole of the executive, the legiſlative, and the judicial powers of this mock republic; like her, his authority is *one* and *indiviſible*; it pervades every part of the body politic; it is ſubordinate to no laws; reſtrained by no modifications; confined by no limits. His will is abſolute; it ſtops all deliberation; annihilates all law; and overleaps all forms. The force of magic could not produce more wonderful effects. In ſhort, from the creation to the preſent day, in no part of the world has ſuch a ſyſtematized code of abſolute power been impoſed on the people. Deſpotiſm has, indeed, exiſted in various countries, and does ſtill exiſt, in many parts of Aſia;—but, in no country or ſtate, has it been before formed into a *ſyſtem*, reduced to *writing*, and divided into *ſections*;—beſides the moſt abſolute and powerful ſovereign of the eaſt would not dare to tranſgreſs the rules and precepts of the Alcoran;—*there* is a boundary beyond which his authority cannot extend. But where are the rules and the precepts which the Firſt Conſul of France dare not tranſgreſs? Where the boundary which can ſtop the progreſs of *his* authority? Certainly the POPE will not be conſidered as this ſacred barrier;—that unhappy pontiff, alas! is ſunk, by his own weakneſs, into the loweſt ſtate of degradation, and, far from interpoſing obſtacles to the will and power of the Conſul, has, like the Romiſh religion which his Conſular

Majeſty

Majeſty affects to profeſs, become his tool and his inſtrument. Even public opinion which has been ever ſuppoſed to operate as a moral check upon the moſt deſpotic princes, has neither efficacy nor influence upon him.—It may indeed be urged that certain modes and forms of proceeding are preſcribed, in judicial caſes, by the conſtitutional code. 'Tis true they are. But the power aſſigned to the Conſul renders them all impotent and nugatory; and *his* conduct conſtitutes the beſt explanation of *their* efficacy. It is a fact too notorious to admit of diſpute or doubt, that the Conſul has, on various occaſions, exerciſed the power of arreſting and puniſhing individuals, for acts not declared to be criminal by any law, without obſerving any of the conſtitutional forms, and without even the appearance of any trial. On all theſe occaſions his will has been the ſubſtitute for law; he has formed the crime, arreſted the offender, decided on his guilt, and puniſhed him with impriſonment, exile, or tranſportation; and, in ſome caſes, the puniſhment, we are aſſured, has extended much farther.—If then the perſon placed at the head of the government has a right, (in violation of that maxim of general law, that principle of juſtice, which declares that a man may ſay or do any thing which the law does not prohibit) to treat as a crime an act which no law forbids; and, by his mandate alone, to deprive any ſubject of his life or liberty, can it be denied that he is, to all intents and purpoſes, a deſpot; or that his power is marked by every attribute and characteriſtic of tyranny? What would Britons ſay, (and ſay with juſtice) if their own beloved ſovereign, whoſe perſonal conduct gives him every claim to their reſpect and love, who never ſold his priſoners of war for ſlaves to an ally, who never directed the deſtruction of a village and the maſſacre of its inhabitants, without diſtinction of age or ſex, for daring to reſent the brutal inſolence of one of his ſoldiers; who never preſided over a ſimilar ſlaughter of the ſubjects of a *friendly* power, for preſuming to make a vain attempt to defend their lives againſt enemies who would not allow them to ſurrender;—who never ordered the murder, in cold blood, of 4500 captives who had yielded to his arms;—who never publickly renounced his Redeemer; nor ever violated any of his duties to God or man; if *he* were to aſſume and to exerciſe ſuch a right over *their* lives or liberties?—Would they not deem *him* an inſupportable tyrant, and *themſelves* moſt abject ſlaves?

Thus then *practice* combines with *theory* to render the *ſovereign people* of the *Great* nation the moſt wretched ſlaves that vegetate on the face of the earth. All the gloomy predictions of Mr. BURKE, which, eloquent as they were, were ſtill leſs diſtinguiſhed for their eloquence than their wiſdom, have been completely fulfilled, and the French revolution, the pretended ſtruggle for *liberty*, has terminated in a military deſpotiſm; a Conſul, the deſpot;—the bayonet, the miniſter of his power.—For *this*, did the miſerable people of that guilty country, murder their lawful ſovereign, juſt, mild, and benignant as he was!—for *this* did they proſcribe their nobility; plunder their clergy; annihilate their laws; deſtroy the ſources of their proſperity; dry up the current of their happineſs; ſubdue the beſt feelings of their nature; and render their native land one continued ſcene of deſolation and blood!

Our aſſertion, that the laſt new conſtitution is even worſe than its predeceſſors may, poſſibly, ſtartle thoſe who have diſcovered ſomething of *mildness* and *equity*, which have, unhappily, eſcaped our obſervation, in the preſent government of France. But let the former codes be examined, and,

and, with all their marks of madneſs and abſurdity, there will be found, in every one of them, at leaſt *ſome* regulations favourable to freedom, and correſponding with the avowed principles on which they were founded. And it is remarkable, that, in no code, before the laſt, were formal proviſions for the freedom of ſpeech and of the preſs omitted; however groſsly thoſe proviſions may have been violated by the tyrants who have ſucceſſively exerciſed the ſupreme power of the country. The framer of the new code, too, has added inſult to injury, in proclaiming its baſis to be *liberty* and *equality*; unleſs, indeed, he meant *liberty of oppreſſion*, and *equality of ſlavery*. As well might he have inſcribed on the laſt priſon of Louis the 16th—*The Temple of Freedom!* *

As to the *preſs*, the Firſt Conſul has gained a complete aſcendancy over it, in every part of the continent of Europe, from the Tiber to the Thames, from the Lena to the Scheldt. Not a ſyllable can be uttered, reſpecting his paſt or preſent conduct, or his future views, in that vaſt extent of country. It is no matter for ſurpriſe, therefore, that he ſhould make ſimilar attempts to ſilence the Britiſh preſs,—that laſt palladium of Britiſh liberty. Remonſtrances on its freedom were very early preferred to the government, by his envoy in this country, even before he was veſted with any diplomatic authority or character; attempts were afterwards made to *bribe* the preſs, by the agency of one of his poetaſters diſpatched hither for the purpoſe; but, this having failed, no doubt to his great aſtoniſhment, the language of remonſtrance was reſumed, and recourſe even had to threats. Enraged, however, at the difficulties which he experienced, in the tranſaction of this important buſineſs, he vented his rage to the world; and, on the 9th of Auguſt, in his own official Gazette, the *Moniteur*, there appeared one of the moſt groſs and infamous libels upon the Britiſh ſovereign and government, that ever iſſued from the preſs. That we may not be ſuſpected of exaggeration, we ſhall inſert the article at length.

"The *Times*, which is ſaid to be under miniſterial inſpection, is filled with perpetual invectives againſt France. Two of its four pages are every day employed in giving currency to the groſſeſt calumnies. All that imagination can depict, that is low, vile, and baſe, is by that miſerable paper attributed to the French government. What is its end? Who pays it? What does it wiſh to effect?

"A French Journal edited by ſome miſerable emigrants, the remnant of the moſt impure, a vile refuſe, without country, without honour, ſullied with crimes which it is not in the power of any amneſty to waſh away, outdoes even the Times.

"Eleven biſhops, preſided over by the atrocious biſhop of Arras, rebels

---

* And yet, ſo ſunk in degradation are theſe mighty republicans, that congratulatory addreſſes, replete with the moſt ſulſome adulation, have been preſented to the Firſt Conſul, who has not only been, fooliſhly, called the benefactor of mankind, but, impiouſly, the *Providence of Europe!*—But this will excite no ſurpriſe in the minds of thoſe who have peruſed the memorable collection of addreſſes, preſented, by the ſame good citizens, to his worthy predeceſſor *Robeſpierre*, who was ſtyled a new planet in the heavens, and whoſe face was given to a picture of the Deity; nor will it even aſtoniſh ſuch as only remember the deification of that good patriot *Marat*.

to

to their country and to the church, have aſſembled in London. They print libels againſt the biſhops and the French clergy; they injure the government and the Pope, who have reeſtabliſhed the peace of the goſpel amongſt 40 millions of Chriſtians.

" The Iſle of Jerſey is full of Brigands, condemned to death by the tribunals for crimes committed ſubſequent to the peace; for aſſaſſinations, robberies, and the practices of an incendiary.

" The treaty of Amiens ſtipulates, that perſons accuſed of crimes, of murder, for inſtance, ſhall be reſpectively delivered up. The aſſaſſins who are at Jerſey are, on the contrary, received. They depart from thence unmoleſted, in fiſhing boats, diſembarked on our coaſts, aſſaſſinate the richeſt proprietors, and burn the ſtacks of corn and the barns.

" Georges wears openly at London his red ribband, as a recompence for the infernal machine which deſtroyed a part of Paris, and killed thirty women and children, or peaceable citizens. This ſpecial protection authorizes a belief, that if he had ſucceeded he would have been honoured with the Order of the Garter.

" Let us make ſome reflections on this ſtrange conduct of our neighbours.

" When two great nations make peace, is it for the purpoſe of reciprocally exciting troubles, or to engage and pay for crimes? Is it for the purpoſe of giving money and protection to all men who wiſh to trouble the ſtate? And as to the liberty of the preſs, is a country to be at liberty to ſpeak of a nation, friendly, and newly reconciled, in a manner which they durſt not ſpeak of a government againſt whom they were proſecuting a deadly war?

" Is not one nation reſponſible to another nation for all the acts and all the conduct of its citizens? Do not acts of parliament even prohibit allied governments, or their ambaſſadors, to be inſulted?

" It is ſaid that Richelieu, under Louis XIII. aſſiſted the revolution in England, and contributed to bring Charles the Firſt to the ſcaffold. M. de Choiſeul, and after him, the miniſters of Louis XVI. doubtleſs excited the inſurrection in America. The late Engliſh miniſtry have had their revenge: they excited the maſſacres of September, and influenced their movements, by means of which Louis XVI. periſhed on the ſcaffold, and by means of which our principal manufacturing cities, ſuch as Lyons, were deſtroyed.

" Is it ſtill wiſhed that this ſeries of movements and influence, which has been productive of ſuch calamitous conſequences to both ſtates, for ſo many ages, ſhould be prolonged? Would it not be more reaſonable, and more conformable to the reſults of experience, to make uſe of the reciprocal influence of proper commercial relations, as the means of protecting commerce, of preventing the fabrication of falſe money, and oppoſing a refuge to criminals?

" Beſides, what reſult can the Engliſh government expect, from fomenting the troubles of the church? from receiving and vomiting back upon our territory the brigands of the *Cotes-du-Nord* and Morbihan, covered with the blood of the beſt and richeſt proprietors of thoſe unfortunate departments, from ſpreading by every means, inſtead of ſeverely repreſſing, all the calumnies circulated by Engliſh writers, or by the French preſs at London. Do they not know that the French government is now more ſolidly

lidly eſtabliſhed than the Engliſh government? And do they think that reciprocity will be difficult for the French government.

"What would be the effect of ſuch an exchange of injuries, of the influence of inſurrectional committees, of the protection and encouragement granted to aſſaſſins? What would be gained to civilization, to the commerce and the happineſs of both nations?

"Either the Engliſh government authorizes and tolerates thoſe public and private crimes, in which caſe it cannot be ſaid that ſuch conduct is conſiſtent with Britiſh generoſity, civilization, and honour; or it cannot prevent them, in which caſe it does not deſerve the name of a government; above all, if it does not poſſeſs the means of repreſſing aſſaſſination and calumny, and protecting ſocial order?"

Our limits will not allow us to give a regular and full anſwer to all the groſs calumnies contained in this precious article, which, we have very good reaſon to believe, was written either by the Firſt Conſul himſelf, or by his hopeful brother *Lucien*. We cannot, however, diſmiſs it without a few brief obſervations. Whatever articles we have read in the *Times*, or in the *Morning Poſt* where the animadverſions on the Conſular government have been infinitely ſtronger, are not to be compared for ſtrength of cenſure, or force of condemnation, with numerous diſquiſitions on the Britiſh government which have iſſued within the laſt year from the Pariſian preſſes. Has the Conſul forgotten *his own* memorable declaration of *the incompatibility of the co-exiſtence of the Britiſh monarchy with the French republic*, ſo much in the ſtile and ſpirit of the above article? If *he* have forgotten it, *we* have not. The libel on the emigrants, who ſacrificed every thing to their attachment to their religion, and their lawful ſovereign, is perfectly in character; though it be ſomewhat novel for a government which has robbed a large body of men of their patrimony, and expelled them from their country, to make ſuch robbery and ſuch expulſion a matter of accuſation againſt them. But we ſuppoſe that this forms a part of the *mildneſs* and *equity* which certain acute obſervers have diſcovered in the preſent government of France. We cannot, however, here refrain from aſking with what propriety men who have been ſo outrageouſly libelled, ſo groſsly calumniated, can be ſubjected to a criminal proſecution, by his Majeſty's attorney general too, for merely cutting a joke upon a man by whoſe authority, at leaſt, and to pleaſe whom, theſe libels and calumnies were publiſhed.

From what is here ſaid about the treaty of Amiens it is eaſy to perceive what a convenient conſtruction will be hereafter put upon it, by the Conſul, whenever any circumſtance of intereſt or caprice may call for its violation.—Though all the ſtipulations of that treaty will be religiouſly obſerved by the government and the country, yet before any man can be apprehended and ſent out of the kingdom on a charge of murder preferred againſt him by a French envoy, a *law* muſt paſs to give effect to that part of the treaty, which makes ſuch proviſion. No law, to that effect, has yet paſſed; and there exiſts no power in the country to do what the Conſul here ſo imperiouſly demands. Perhaps his Conſular Majeſty will be equally ſurpriſed to hear, that the BISHOP of ARRAS, who lives under the protection of Britiſh laws, could proſecute and puniſh the proprietors and publiſhers of every paper which has reprinted the libellous attack upon him, and even the author of the article himſelf, were he reſident in this country.—The aſſertion that our ſovereign beſtows honours and rewards on *aſſaſſins*,

is ſo infamouſly falſe, ſo horribly indecent, that we are at a loſs for words to expreſs our ſenſe of it. But, it muſt be confeſſed, that ſuch a charge comes with peculiar propriety from one who complains of the freedom of the Britiſh preſs. The "*reflections*" which follow this falſe ſtatement of facts, are the evident offſprings of ignorance and malice. If the author had ever read our parliamentary debates, which are circulated throughout Europe, he would have ſpared his falſhoods reſpecting our freedom of obſervation on hoſtile and on allied governments. Mr. Pitt's comments on the revolutionary government of France, and Mr. Fox's animadverſions on all the powers who were in alliance with us during the late war, would have ſufficed to convince him of his error. When this petulant writer affirmed that the *late Engliſh miniſtry* excited the maſſacres of September, and other enormities in France, he probably had forgotten, that Mr. ADDINGTON and Lord HAWKESBURY were members of that miniſtry, and, as members alſo of the Privy Council, concurred in adviſing all the meaſures which were purſued by the government, during the war. If then the miniſtry really excited theſe horrid murders which rouzed the indignation of all Europe, (and in which, by the bye, one of the Firſt Conſul's colleagues in Egypt is known to have taken a leading part) the preſent miniſters muſt have been *participes criminis*. And how can ſuch an accuſation be reconciled with the high character given, by the Conſular journals, of our preſent premier? It may be convenient to certain perſons in France to encourage the novel idea that the act of making peace obliterates the crime of murder, and purges the aſſaſſin from his guilt; but, ſurely, paſſion prevailed over reaſon when the public attention was thus called to *maſſacres*, ere the ſcenes of *Tenasco*,* *Alexandria*,† and *Jaffa*‡ were eraſed from their minds.—The fact is, that the aſſertion is as falſe as it is infamous; and the whole article diſplays an admirable ſpecimen of modern French liberty, which conſiſts in ſaying and doing whatever the Conſul pleaſes to ſay or do, and in preventing others from ſaying or doing any thing which he does not pleaſe ſhould be ſaid or done. It alſo unfolds, in a very clear point of view his notions reſpecting the nature of a government; he not deeming that deſerving the name of a government, which is not ſuperior to law! Since the publication of this libel, the Conſul has prohibited, not by virtue of any exiſting law, but by the ſole virtue of that abſolute power which we have proved him to poſſeſs, the entry of all Britiſh newſpapers into his dominions. Here he has done right; if he find himſelf ſo deficient in argument as to be unable to anſwer, through the medium of his writers and journaliſts, the objections which are urged againſt his political conduct, it is highly prudent in him to prevent his ſubjects from reading thoſe objections. *Fas eſt et ab hoſte doceri*; and, therefore, he may be taught by us, that he will reap more credit and greater advantage from ſuch an exerciſe of his power, than by vain attempts to ſilence the Britiſh preſs, and to deſtroy the eſſence of Britiſh freedom.

Our obſervations, curtailed as they are, on the two grand topics, of the laſt new French conſtitution, and the libel in the *Moniteur*, have been extended ſo far, as to diſable us from animadverting, as we intended, on va-

---

* See Mr. Pitt's memorable ſpeech.

† See Buonaparte's own account of his firſt exploit in Egypt, in the *Moniteur*.

‡ See Mozier's Tract, and the poſtſcript to the ſecond edition of Mr. Windham's ſpeech.

rious

rious other ſubjects of political importance. The monſtrous connection between France and Ruſſia; the views of thoſe powers and of Pruſſia; the ſyſtematic humiliation of the houſe of Auſtria; the plunder of the minor ſtates of Germany, ycleped *Indemnities*; the annexation of Piedmont to France; the ſchiſm in the Helvetic republic; the ſtrange ſtate of the new kingdom of Etruria; the ſingular reception in France of the leading members of the late oppoſition in the Britiſh parliament; and the dangerous illneſs of Mr. Pitt;—all, in our conception, portending miſchief to our own country, call for diſtinct and ſeparate diſcuſſion, opening a field of enquiry fertile in important leſſons, to the ſtateſman and the patriot. It is impoſſible to view the actual ſtate of Europe, without the bitterest regret for the paſt, the deepeſt concern for the preſent, and the moſt gloomy apprehenſions for the future. May that good Providence, to whom alone our ſafety hitherto is to be aſcribed, turn from us the evils which we deplore, and avert the more ſerious calamities which we dread!

But, though we are thus compelled to poſtpone our obſervations on many important points; we cannot cloſe this brief ſummary without moſt earneſtly directing the attention of our miniſtry to one particular object. It is a fact, unleſs we are groſsly miſinformed, that many thouſands of French Republicans are actually reſident in the metropolis and its vicinity, and that thoſe precautions which are adopted in France reſpecting the admiſſion of foreigners into the country are wholly neglected here. It is alſo known that General ANDREOSSI, the expected ambaſſador from the Firſt Conſul, will bring with him a complete ſtaff, and a large retinue of general and other officers. The conſequence is ſo obvious that it is needleſs for us to ſtate it. Whether Buonaparte has fixed on this general, as his ambaſſador at the court of St. James's, becauſe he is *not* a Frenchman, or becauſe he was the perſon appointed, during the war, to maintain a correſpondence with all the traitors and diſaffected in Great Britain and Ireland, and to concert with them the various plans ſuggeſted for the invaſion of this country, we preſume not to decide. We do not allude to theſe circumſtances with a view to impute blame to the General or his Maſter, for any ſchemes or tranſactions planned or perpetrated in times of hoſtility; but merely with a view to rouze the vigilance of our government, and to urge them to the adoption of ſuch meaſures as may be found, on inveſtigation, to be neceſſary for ſelf-preſervation and ſelf-defence. Nor will our Miniſters wonder at our fears when they recollect the real object of *Gallois'* miſſion to England; and remember that the writer of this article, by detecting and expoſing it to the adminiſtration of that day, was the cauſe of that order which forbade Gallois to come within leſs than ten miles of the capital. Being thus diſappointed in his projects, he immediately left the country and returned to France.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Gentleman to whom the letter of "A TRUE ROYALIST," dated Lombard-ſtreet, Sept. 1, was addreſſed, was prevented, by his abſence from town, from noticing it in the manner preſcribed. He now, therefore, acknowledges the receipt of the communication through this channel, and ſhall be happy to receive future communications from the ſame quarter.—He could wiſh to addreſs a private letter to the *Royalist*, who may implicitly rely on the moſt honourable and rigid ſecrecy.

ERRATUM.—In the Anagram on Sir Francis Burdett—for *Burdet*, read *Burdett*.